DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 474 HE 014 491

AUTHOR	Preer, Jean L.
TITLE	Minority Access to Higher Education: AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report 1.
INSTITUTION	American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	81
CONTRACT	400-77-0073
NOTE	55p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036 ($4.00 members, $5.50 nonmembers).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Advising; *Access to Education; Admission Criteria; Affirmative Action; Black Students; College Role; *College Students; Court Litigation; Cultural Awareness; Educational Background; *Enrollment Trends; Females; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Hispanic Americans; *Minority Groups; *Public Policy; *School Holding Power; Student Needs; Two Year Colleges; Upper Division Colleges; Womens Education

ABSTRACT

The current status of minority enrollment in higher education and specific concerns that affect students and the institution are examined. Minority enrollment at different institutional levels, in different fields of study, and over different periods of time is examined. Findings reveal a more complex pattern of gains and slowdowns than gross statistics for the last decade indicate. Hispanics and women continue to increase their share of the total enrollment, but blacks experience a slackening momentum. The policy framework created by legislation and litigation on issues affecting student access is considered, and the following three related issues are examined: the pool of minority applicants; designing more equitable admission procedures; and retaining minority students through graduation. Minority groups, especially blacks and Hispanics, suffer from inadequate secondary school preparation and counseling and from economic and psychometric barriers. They are disproportionately overrepresented in two-year institutions and underrepresented in four-year colleges and graduate and professional schools. Measures of particular applicability to specific minority group concern must reflect a sensitivity to an institution's own makeup and institutional role. Such measures require an internal system of data gathering to indicate enrollment trends and retention problems; recruitment of faculty and professional staff trained in teaching or counseling poorly prepared students and sensitive to diverse minority group needs; and development of campus services responsive to the linguistic and cultural traditions of minority students. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

ED207474

Report 1981

Minority Access to Higher Education

Jean L. Preer

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE014491

ERIC

AAHE

Minority Access to Higher Education

Jean L. Preer

AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 1, 1981

Prepared by

ERIC®
Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University

Published by

AAHE
American Association for Higher Education

Cite as:
Preer, Jean L. *Minority Access to Higher Education.* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036

American Association for Higher Education
One Dupont Circle, Suite 780
Washington, D.C. 20036

This publication was prepared with funding from the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. 400-77-0073. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or the Department.

Foreword

In examining the degree of progress made from the mid-'60s to the mid-'70s toward achieving the goals of student aid programs—promoting equal access and equal institutional choice and advancing equal retention and completion—Larry L. Leslie states:

> *The summary data by race are the most encouraging of those presented. Parity in college access and choice have nearly been achieved for all minority groups taken as a whole. In terms of subgroups, blacks have made access and choice gains of major proportions, but they continue to be somewhat under enrolled overall (1977, p. 3).*

There have been some fundamental changes since the mid-1970s that may affect the progress of minorites in higher education access and choice as documented by Leslie's 1977 Research Report. While student aid has increased in total dollars, the size of individual awards has not kept up proportionally with the increase in college costs. Legal challenges to affirmative-action admission programs raised concern about the active continuance of such programs. Institutions, under pressure to curtail expenses, increasingly are reluctant to maintain or develop remedial and counseling programs. Traditionally black colleges because of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the case of *Adams* v. *Richardson* are under strong pressure to increase their white-student enrollment.

This Research Report takes a careful look at the status of minority access to higher education. After examining the current status of minority enrollment, specific concerns that affect students and the institution are reviewed. The author, Jean L. Preer, a writer on educational topics, holds both a J.D. degree and a Ph.D. in American Civilization from the George Washington University; her dissertation was on "Law and Social Policy: Desegregation in Public Higher Education."

Jonathan D. Fife
Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education

Contents

1 Overview

3 Access Trends
3 Defining Access
4 Measuring Access
7 Progress at Different Levels

13 Student Concerns
13 Policy Parameters
17 Access Issues

26 Institutional Concerns
27 The Federal Role
28 Defining Desegregation
29 Implementing Change
33 Limiting Factors

37 Summary and Conclusions

40 Bibliography

Overview

The U.S. Supreme Court in *Brown* v. *Board of Education* set the fundamental standard for minority access to higher education: Admission to publicly supported colleges and universities may not be denied on the basis of race. Since 1954, legal definitions and educational techniques have expanded the concept of access: including other minority groups, increasing the role of the federal government and the responsibilities of universities, and looking beyond admissions to retention and graduation. The lowering of legal barriers revealed long-standing economic and social handicaps that continue to limit student choices in pursuing higher education.

The decade of the 1970s witnessed some notable gains in the enrollment of black and other minority students. Black undergraduate enrollment, for example, tripled between 1966 and 1978. But despite increased awareness of minority access issues, problem areas remained. Minority students continued to be overrepresented in two-year programs and significantly underrepresented at the graduate level. While historically black colleges enrolled proportionately less of the total black student body, their students were better able to stay the course to graduation than black students on white campuses. After some early increases, the rate of growth and proportion of minority enrollment in law and medical schools have leveled off.

To a remarkable extent, questions of legal standards and educational policy became intertwined in the 1970s. Affirmative action programs to increase minority enrollment were launched both in response to the mandate of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and in recognition of the educational needs of previously underrepresented ethnic groups. In challenging voluntary affirmative action programs, the *DeFunis* and *Bakke* cases raised legal questions about the validity of arbitrary quotas for minority admissions and educational questions as to the validity of traditional testing and admission procedures. The Supreme Court's decision in *Bakke*, which disallowed racial quotas but permitted the use of race as a factor in admissions decisions, was criticized by civil rights groups but was found by government analysts to have had little subsequent effect.

Questions of affirmative action in the 1970s overlapped with the continuing controversy over desegregation in public higher education. Central to both was the underrepresentation of minority students in higher education. But desegregation efforts have followed a more tortuous legal course and have involved a more institutional approach to the underlying education issues. Early desegregation suits sought the admission of qualified black students to white institutions and emphasized the inferiority of separate black colleges. Even after the *Brown* decision was applied to higher education, black students continued to enroll at historically black colleges that offered both a supportive social environment and a tradition of training poorly prepared and economically disadvantaged students.

The suit brought by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) Legal Defense Fund, in 1970, of *Adams* v. *Richardson* sought to compel the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

(HEW) to enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 against systems of public higher education whose enrollment patterns reflected the vestiges of segregation. Following the intervention of black educators through the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education and through protracted negotiation, HEW issued criteria in 1977 for acceptable state desegregation plans. These criteria went beyond efforts to recruit minority students and faculty members and included institutional considerations not characteristic of affirmative action. A number of these echo the recommendations of educators made solely on the basis of educational policy: the definition of institutional scope and mission, the elimination of unnecessary program duplication, the inclusion of minority members in university governance, and the enhancement of historically black colleges.

Both affirmative action and desegregation efforts seek new ways by which to attract, retain, and involve minority groups at all levels of higher education systems. Economic hard times and a worsening racial climate threaten to affect both. Legal actions in the 1970s focused attention on the question of minority access and set more explicit criteria for gauging compliance. The success of government officials and educators in devising and supporting techniques to attract and retain minority students remains the challenge of the 1980s.

Access Trends

Defining Access

The concept of minority access to higher education is multi-faceted. The definition of access has expanded as efforts to increase minority enrollment have revealed new problems and complexities. Progress in minority access is no longer gauged by the total number of minority students registering each fall, although this remains the yearly benchmark. Educators and policy makers increasingly are looking beyond the gross indicators of trends to more detailed breakdowns of data and more subtle shifts in enrollment patterns. Among these concerns are:

- Progress over time. Long-term gains may obscure short-term losses or periods of stagnation.
- Progress relative to other groups. Gains made in a period of overall growth may fail to close proportional gaps in enrollment and graduation.
- Progress at different levels. Overall gains may mask disproportional enrollment in certain types of institutions or fields of study.

Since the end of World War II, the general thrust in higher education has been to increase the proportion of high school graduates going on to some form of postsecondary training. In 1947, for example, the President's Commission on Higher Education recommended that the proportion of high school graduates obtaining at least two years of college education be increased from one-sixth to one-half. (U.S. President's Commission 1947, vol. 1, p. 39). We have met that earlier goal. Currently about 50 percent of high school graduates enter some form of postsecondary training. But expectations have expanded along with enrollment; we now aspire to universal access for all students who seek or could benefit from some form of higher education.

The legal campaign of the NAACP and, later, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund successfully overcame the legal barriers that limited the educational opportunities of black students at all levels of public education. The mid-1960s brought increased federal funding to higher education, in the Higher Education Act of 1965, and toughened means of federal enforcement against discriminatory use of those funds in Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The evolution of the case of *Adams* v. *Richardson* reflected the increasing scope of the concept of access. When filed in 1970, the suit's focus on higher education centered on two indicators of vestigal segregation: the small number of black students enrolled on formerly all-white campuses and the continued distribution of students along racial lines at publicly supported white and black colleges. The amended criteria for state higher education desegregation plans, issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1977 (U.S. Office for Civil Rights 1978), encompassed a much broader and deeper concept of access.

- Student parity was defined as proportional participation by black students in higher education measured by high school completion rates,

enrollment according to type of institution and field of study, and persistence until graduation.

- Institutional parity was defined not only as increased proportions of black students at every level, but also as increased proportions of black faculty, staff, and governing board members; more explicit definitions of institutional roles; and more equitable distribution of funds and programs between black and white campuses.

Measuring Access

Data collected on minority enrollment reflect the increasing complexity of the concept of access. As the major source of higher education statistics, the federal government has been criticized by educational institutions that must report minority enrollment data and by minority group leaders who challenge the validity of the results (Abramowitz 1976). Critics of data from the Census Bureau challenge the reliability of conclusions based on interviews of only 50,000 households, although the bureau provides the only long-term statistics on which to gauge progress (NACBHE 1979a, p. 10). The other major compiler of data, HEW's Office for Civil Rights (now in the Department of Education) also has been criticized. Its early biennial surveys lacked continuity, omitted certain ethnic groups, and covered only full-time students (NACBHE 1979a, p. 10).

In 1976, the Office for Civil Rights instituted major changes to improve the reliability of its statistical information. The 1976 survey included, for the first time, minority group enrollment figures from Alaska and Hawaii that previously had been excluded because of their ethnic composition (Coughlin 1978). To minimize the burden on reporting institutions, the Office for Civil Rights and the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) agreed in 1976 to conduct a single fall enrollment survey to satisfy the requirements of both. Racial and ethnic enrollment statistics and field of study data are collected on alternate years of the annual fall enrollment survey (NCES 1979b, p. iii).

Although the data are less than perfect, they are constantly improving and remain the best source of information available to educators and policy makers now. This report will rely chiefly on data from the Office for Civil Rights, NCES, and the Census Bureau to see patterns of progress and stagnation in minority access. Despite their limitations, they reflect the increased attention to the diversity of minority groups and to the distribution of minority students at different types of institutions and in different fields of study.

Progress over time. Using 1964 as a watershed year in minority access to higher education, the data reveal profound long-term changes. In particular, enrollment of both blacks and Hispanics has increased in absolute numbers and in proportion to total enrollment. This pattern was noticeable especially at the undergraduate level. Although his study documents many areas of insufficient gain, Lorenzo Morris acknowledges the gradual, con-

sistent progress of blacks toward parity with whites in college enrollment (Morris 1979, p. 264). From 1966 to 1976, the proportion of college enrollees who are black increased from 4.6 percent to 10.7 percent, and the number of black college students increased more than 275 percent (NCES 1978a, pp. 120-21). In absolute terms, this represented an increase from 282,000 to 1,062,000. The Census Bureau reported a tripling of black college enrollment from 1966 to 1978 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, May 1980, p. 2).

Although he noted the acceptance of the concept of universal access to postsecondary education, Crossland (1971, p. 105) predicted that black enrollment "probably will not reach, by 1980, the point at which the ratio of black students to total enrollment equals the ratio of all blacks to the total population. Other minorities will be even more poorly represented." Despite the gains of the 1970s, census and enrollment statistics confirm Crossland's prediction. Census figures for 1980 show blacks composing 11.7 percent of the national population and Hispanics 6.4 percent ("'80 Census" 1981). These figures, in fact, may be low. Enrollment figures for fall 1980 show black students representing 9.2 percent and Hispanic students 3.0 percent of total enrollment (Fact-File, Feb. 9, 1981).

Although not tabulated as accurately until recently, the enrollment of Hispanic students and all minority students shows similar long-term gains. The Census bureau reports an increase of Hispanic students from 242,000 in 1972 to 377,000 in 1978 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1979, p. 4). A report by the National Association of College Admission Counselors put total minority enrollment at 8 percent in 1969, increasing to 13 percent in 1977 (Middleton, Oct. 16, 1978).

The undeniable magnitude of change over the last decade and a half should not obscure the variation in progress from year to year. All the data sources report whopping enrollment gains in the 1974 to 1976 period (Coughlin 1978) followed by much smaller increases and some declines from 1976 to 1978 (U.S. Office for Civil Rights 1980). For example, black enrollment from 1976 to 1978 slowed in comparison to its growth earlier in the decade, reflecting a general shift to two-year programs and part-time studies (Mingle 1980, p. 16). The Office for Civil Rights reported black undergraduate enrollment rising 19.6 percent between 1974 to 1976 (compared with a drop of 0.8 percent for whites) but falling 0.6 percent between 1976 and 1978 (compared with a 2.1 percent drop for whites) (U.S. Office for Civil Rights 1980). Similarly, Hispanic undergraduate enrollment rose 21.8 percent between 1974 and 1976, but only 12 percent between 1976 and 1978. Gains for total undergraduate enrollment in the two periods were 23 percent and 1.2 percent, respectively.

Progress relative to other groups. A static picture of enrollment in 1978 shows that the proportion of blacks, Hispanics, and all minority students combined is concentrated at the bottom of the higher education hierarchy. At each of these levels, however, the changes in enrollment between 1976 and 1978 varied markedly among ethnic groups. Most significant, Hispanic gains remained high, exceeding black gains (12.9 percent versus 1.9 per-

1978 (OCR data)	Black	Hispanic	Total Minority
Percentage of total undergraduate enrollment	10.4	4.0	17.2
Percentage of total two-year enrollment	10.9	6.5	20.8
Percentage of total four-year enrollment	8.5	2.6	13.5
Percentage of total graduate enrollment	5.8	2.3	10.4
Percentage of total first professional enrollment	4.5	2.7	9.4

Source: U.S. Office for Civil Rights, *Racial, Ethnic, and Sex Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1978* (Washington, D.C.: 1980).

cent) overall and at the undergraduate (12.2 versus 0.0), graduate (4.0 versus −5.3), and first professional level (14.0 versus 2.2).

Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders also recorded notable gains at each level. American Indians and Alaskan natives, working from a small numerical base, registered moderate overall and undergraduate increases but suffered declines in graduate and first professional enrollment (NCES 1979b, p. 7).

Thus, among various minority groups, the momentum seems to have shifted from gains in black enrollment to increases in Hispanic enrollment. From 1976 to 1978, Hispanic enrollment gained faster nationally than either whites or blacks (Mingle 1980). Despite their recent and rapid gains, Hispanic students representing 4 percent of all college students aged 14 to 34 in 1978 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, May 1980, p. 3) still were underrepresented (Mingle 1980).

Just as the data indicate differing rates of growth among various minority groups, reports also reveal differences between men and women. Since 1966, according to NCES, the proportion of white men has fallen while the proportions of white women, black men, and black women have increased (NCES 1978a, p. 120). Nationally, women still receive less than half of all college degress (NGES 1978a, pp. 138-39).

Among black men and women, however, the pattern is markedly different. Enrollment statistics for 1978 indicated that black women outnumber black men at both the four-year and two-year levels and in both full-time and part-time categories (NCES 1980, pp. 140-41). Data recently published show black women earning more degrees than black men at every level (associate, bachelor's, master's, M.D., J.D., Ph.D./Ed.D.) at the close of 1975-76 academic year (NCES 1980, pp. 140-41).

Variations by region. Access trends also have been studied according to region in order to assess differences in minority enrollment from patterns nationally. Data from the member states of the Southern Regional Edu-

cation Board (SREB) (Mingle 1980) and from 19 states affected by the *Adams* case (Brazziel and Brazziel 1980) reveal some areas of greater progress. Within each group, individual states report developments at odds with regional trends. Because overall enrollment in the South has been increasing, as at the national level, minority gains have not significantly altered the total enrollment picture (Brazziel and Brazziel 1980, p. 34).

In 1952, black students constituted 13 percent of total college enrollment in the South. In 1978, the proportion of black students had grown to only about 15 percent (Mingle 1980, p. 5). The black population in SREB states is about 19 percent (Mingle 1980, p. 2). This percentage compares to a 9.3 percent black enrollment nationally where the black population is about 12 percent of the total. Analyzing the 19 *Adams* states, the Brazziels report undergraduate enrollment 13.8 percent black in a total population that is 16.7 percent black (1980, p. 8).

Statistics for SREB states, like figures for national trends discussed earlier, show a slowdown in black enrollment. Between 1976 and 1978, total black enrollment grew only 4 percent, as did white, while total regional enrollment rose 4.9 percent (Mingle 1980, p. 19). In several respects, however, progress in the South exceeded that for the nation as a whole. Percentage gains in total enrollment in SREB states as a whole (4.9 percent) and in all the SREB states except Louisiana, Mississippi, and West Virginia, exceeded the percentage gain for the United States (2.4 percent) (Mingle 1980). Also, Hispanic enrollment rose 12.8 percent nationally between 1976 and 1978, but rose 17.3 percent in SREB states. Texas and Florida, in particular, have large Hispanic populations. Black enrollment gained proportionately more, or held ground better, in SREB states at the undergraduate, graduate, and first professional degree level (Mingle 1980, p. 4). Nevertheless, in nine SREB states, black enrollment gains were smaller (or losses larger) than white enrollment. Among the larger group of *Adams* states, the Brazziels reported higher black participation rates in northern and border states with higher incomes and a good mix of black and white colleges than in states farther south with lower incomes (1980, pp. 66-67).

Progress at Different Levels

The concept of access not only has expanded horizontally to include more minority groups, especially Hispanics and women, in addition to blacks, it also has expanded vertically to consider the relative proportions of the available applicant pools completing high school and the proportion of minority students completing undergraduate degrees and entering graduate school. At either end of the access continuum, the patterns emerging for minority enrollment are less promising than the overall statistics indicate.

At the secondary school level, dramatic gains have been made in reducing the disparities between the high school graduation rates of whites and blacks. In 1970, 78 percent of whites, but only 56 percent of blacks,

between the ages of 25 to 29 were high school graduates. In 1979, the gap had been reduced from 22 percent to 12 percent with an 87 percent graduation rate for whites compared to 75 percent for blacks (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Aug. 1980, p. 2). Long-term analysis shows similar progress in raising the level of schooling for both races (NCES 1979a, p. 27).

Even more progress has been made in achieving parity in the rates of high school graduates enrolling in college. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare adopted as a goal for state higher education desegregation plans reduction of the disparities in college attendance rates between white and black high school graduates (U.S. Office for Civil Rights 1978). Before its adoption as a legal standard, equality of participation rates had long been a goal of educators (Commission on Higher Educational Opportunity 1967). Census Bureau figures show that in 1967 only 23.3 percent of black high school graduates enrolled in college compared to 34.5 percent of white graduates. In 1977, the black enrollment rate of 31.5 percent nearly equaled the 32.2 percent rate for whites (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1979, p. 2).

Similarly, the gap between whites and blacks, ages 18 to 24, who had not graduated from high school and were not enrolled in school, narrowed considerably between 1967 and 1977 (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1979, p. 2). Nevertheless, in 1977 this meant that the number of black high school dropouts, ages 18 to 24 (808,000), exceeded the number of black college students (721,000) (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1979, p. 2; NACBHE 1979a, p. xii).

Blacks and other minority students have not made as much progress narrowing the disparities in college completion rates. Using the college completion rate of majority (white) males as the standard, the Commission on Civil Rights has calculated Social Indicator Values comparing college completion by different ethnic groups and by women (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1978a, p. 14). Among some groups, Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans, and Philippino Americans, completion rates for both men and women in 1976 equaled the rate for majority males. Progress among American Indians/Alaskan natives, blacks, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans was uneven with both black males and females registering 32 percent of the rate for majority males in 1976. In 1960, black males stood at 20 percent and black females at 31 percent of the rate for majority males, indicating one area where the progress among black males exceeded that of black females. Overall, in the period between 1970 and 1980, the number of college graduates increased 5.6 percent for whites compared to 3.4 percent for blacks (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Aug. 1980, p. 2). Thus, despite the progress among blacks, progress among whites was even greater.

The concept of access has evolved to include parity in the rates of participation of minority students at all levels of higher education. Nevertheless, access trends continue to indicate minority concentrations in the early phases of postsecondary training. This is true at the national and regional levels and for blacks, Hispanics, and other ethnic groups. Breaking

down enrollment patterns into the following categories reveals the complexities involved in gauging progress.

- *Two-year versus four-year enrollment* shows continued growth at the two-year level.
- *Part-time versus full-time enrollment* obscures the gap between full-time equivalent and headcount statistics.
- *Public college versus private college growth* shows the continued vitality of the public sector.
- *Predominantly white college versus historically black college* reveals large increases in minority enrollment on white campuses and possible declines at black colleges.

Although studies have isolated changes in each of these areas, it is important to recall that these areas also are interrelated. The multi-faceted nature of access means that changes in enrollment at one level or type of institution can affect patterns in another.

Two-year versus four-year enrollment. Looking at nationwide patterns, after the surge of growth in community colleges in the 1960s, the relative proportions of enrollment at institutions of various levels have remained about the same. In 1978, universities enrolled 24.6 percent of all students, other four-year institutions, 39.7 percent, and two-year institutions 35.7 percent. These figures show slight drops in the proportion of university and four-year enrollment since 1973 relative to two-year college enrollment (NCES 1979b, p. 10).

Although all minority groups are represented disproportionately in two-year institutions, there are differences in enrollment patterns. The proportion of black enrollment at the two-year level is closer to that of white students and students as a whole. The figure varies depending on region and type of institutional control. In the *Adams* states, according to the Brazziels, 36 percent of black students were at two-year colleges (p. 18). The National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities estimates 42 percent (1979, p. xiii). Using data only from public institutions, NCES reports that in 1978, about 34 percent of all students were in two-year colleges, compared to 33 percent of whites, 39 percent of blacks, and 53 percent of Hispanics and American Indians/Alaskan natives (1980, pp. 97, 110). The difference between blacks and Hispanics may be due to both the more recent nature of efforts to increase Hispanic enrollment and to the fact that historically black colleges tend to offer four-year programs.

Part-time versus full-time enrollment. Although black colleges enroll a decreasing proportion of total black enrollment, their full-time residential character has meant that black participation in full-time higher education programs traditionally has exceeded the national average. This pattern may be changing, however. Between 1976 and 1978, part-time enrollment

of blacks increased 15.8 percent compared to 13 percent for all students; full-time enrollment of blacks decreased 0.5 percent compared to an increase of 0.6 percent for all students (Mingle 1980, p. 6). If part-time enrollment for blacks is calculated as full-time equivalent, black enrollment, according to Mingle, increased only 0.6 percent nationally and 1.5 percent in the South between 1976 and 1978 (1980, p. 1).

Nationally, Hispanics are more likely to be enrolled part time than students generally (U.S. Bureau of the Census, May 1980, p. 3), but in the South, their participation rate is the same as that of the total population (Mingle 1980, p. 11).

Public college versus private college. Over the past decade, the public sector of higher education has experienced the greatest growth. Similarly, minority enrollment has grown most dramatically in public institutions, particularly at the four-year level (NCES 1978a, pp. 118-19). In the 19 *Adams* states studied by the Brazziels, 80 percent of all black students were enrolled in public institutions (1980, p. 63). When institutions in the Brazziel study were identified by race, half again as many black students were enrolled in white public colleges as in black public colleges in 1978 (1980 p. 38). At both the two-year and four-year levels, Hispanics were enrolled more heavily in public than in private institutions in 1978 (Mingle 1980, p. 13).

Predominantly white college versus historically black college. Ironically, in a period of overall growth in minority enrollment, the institutions most affected have been the historically black institutions. The role of these colleges in desegregation will be discussed in more detail in the chapter on institutional concerns. However, enrollment data give a picture of the phenomenon.

Until recently, as minority enrollment—particularly of black students—increased at white institutions, it also held steady or increased at black public and private colleges. Only the proportion of black enrollment attending black colleges decreased. Between 1976 and 1978, however, black colleges may have suffered real enrollment drops. Mingle reports that both nationally and in the South, black colleges, both private and public, lost black enrollment (1980, pp. 18, 20). Black public colleges in the South reported the largest decreases.

Among the 19 *Adams* states, of eight states reporting increases of more than 1,000 black students at white colleges, four reported enrollment gains at black four-year colleges, and four reported declines. Several black colleges in states involved in desegregation efforts reported declines, including Tennessee State University (Ivey 1979, p. 6), Cheney State College in Pennsylvania (Paul 1980b, p. 6), and Florida A&M (Middleton, Jan. 21, 1980, p. 15). If this pattern continues, it may threaten efforts to upgrade and improve traditionally black colleges as a key part of desegregating higher education. Some unofficial reports indicate that black colleges may

be sharing in the overall enrollment increases reported at the start of the 1980-81 school year.

Fields of study. The concept of access embraces not only *where* minority students are studying but *what* they are studying. This concern, especially for black students, grows out of past emphasis on teacher education and failure to train minorities in technical and more remunerative fields. Recent efforts to attract minority students to more diverse undergraduate majors have been partially successful. However, at the graduate and professional level, both in the proportion and distribution of minority enrollment, old patterns of underrepresentation persist.

Major shifts in fields of study have occurred at the undergraduate level, particularly among blacks. The Census Bureau figures indicate that the proportion of undergraduate blacks studying education or social science subjects dropped from about 40 percent in 1966 to 17 percent in 1978, and the proportion of business students rose from 15 percent to 22 percent (U.S. Bureau of the Census, May 1980, pp. 2-3). Because overall black enrollment greatly increased over the same period, the number of business students rose from 41,000 to 220,000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, May 1980, p. 2). Nevertheless, blacks remained vastly underrepresented in technical and scientific fields (Blake, Lambert, and Martin 1974; Southern Regional Education Board 1980).

For other minorities the picture is somewhat different. Hispanics are represented in the fields of business, education, and English in the same proportion as for all students (U.S. Bureau of the Census, May 1980, p. 3). Like blacks, Hispanics are underrepresented in science and engineering fields (Mingle 1980, p. 14). Asian Americans, however, are well represented in the sciences, and American Indians hold a share corresponding to their share in the population (Southern Regional Education Board 1980, p. 2).

At the graduate and professional level, progress has been minimal. The total number of students and degrees awarded has outpaced increases in minority students enrolling and graduating. The shifts in fields of study at the undergraduate level have not yet been reflected in studies of educational attainment at the graduate level. The distribution of doctorates in 1978-79 showed blacks and Hispanics participating at a rate lower than their proportion in the total population. Blacks received 3.5 percent of all doctorates; Hispanics 1.7 percent (Fact-File, Jan. 12, 1981). These figures show a slight change from 1975-76 when blacks received 3.6 percent and Hispanics 1.2 percent (NCES 1978a, pp. 140-41). Figures from NCES for 1975-76 showed that more Ph.D.s were awarded to nonresident aliens than to all minority students combined (NCES 1978a, pp. 140-41).

The picture for professional studies is more depressing, revealing declines rather than small gains. Efforts to increase enrollment in professional schools had success in the early '70s (Blackwell 1975), but seem to have peaked in 1971. In 1975-76 blacks earned 5.2 percent of the medical degrees and 4.7 percent of the law degrees; for Hispanics, the totals were 2.3 percent and 2.6 percent (NCES 1978a, pp. 140-41).

Progress in black enrollment has stagnated while increases in the number of women has continued. Black enrollment in 1978-79 grew 2.5 percent, the same as the growth rate for total enrollment; the number of women increased 6.8 percent (In Brief, Feb. 19, 1980a). The ethnic breakdown of the record enrollment for 1980-81 reported by the Association of American Medical Colleges was as follows: blacks 5.7 percent, Hispanics 4.2 percent, Asians 3.0 percent, American Indians 0.3 percent, foreign 1.7 percent. The figure for blacks represented a decline from 6.2 percent five years ago (In Brief, Nov. 17, 1980). In 1978-79, blacks suffered a 2 percent drop in law school enrollment and women gained 5 percent (In Brief, Feb. 19, 1980b). Figures reported by the American Bar Association for 1980-81 showed an overall increase of 1.5 percent since fall 1979. Women compose 33.5 percent and minorities 9.7 percent of law school enrollment, a slight gain over the previous year (Jacobson, Feb. 17, 1981, p. 22). It is not clear how black women were counted in these tabulations, an issue of controversy among minority educators (Smith 1977).

There is no reason why the proportion of students studying in each field should reflect the composition of the population as a whole (O'Neil 1975, p. 149). Community needs, for example, may dictate areas of concentration. Nevertheless, enrollment figures can show patterns and gauge change. Despite some increases in certain fields and some shifts away from more traditional disciplines, gains are not proportional overall. Where concerted efforts are made to increase minority participation, progress is reflected. Lopez cites the increase in Hispanic enrollment in medical schools as a case in point (1976, p. 115).

Thus, an examination of minority enrollment at different institutional levels, in different fields of study, and over different periods of time reveals a more complex pattern of gains and slowdowns than gross statistics for the last decade indicate. Hispanics and women continue to increase their share of the total enrollment, but blacks experience a slackening momentum.

Student Concerns

The data on minority enrollment in higher education underscore the complexities of assessing the magnitude and direction of change. Despite long-term progress in increasing the numbers of minority students, higher education is far from achieving parity or functional equity for diverse ethnic and racial groups at all institutional levels. Black students have benefited from the general surge in higher education over the past decade (Morris 1979) as well as from programs oriented to their specific needs (NACBHE 1979a, pp. 35-36). Similarly, Hispanics and other minority groups and women were aided by the impetus of the civil rights movement. Progress for Hispanics and women seems to be continuing, but the momentum for black enrollment seems to be slowing. The National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities (1979a) warns that

> *left alone and not persistently forged or constantly defined the potential progress of Black Americans in higher education will be adversely affected. Cyclical periods of inattention and resistance to the advancement of Black Americans are the rule rather than the exception (p. xi).*

Although higher education as a whole faces the prospect of declining enrollment and diminishing resources, minority enrollment has not yet reached its potential. Furthermore, the proportion of minority youth is increasing. It is predicted that by the year 2000, 25 to 30 percent of young people will be minorities (Mingle 1980, p. v). Along with older students, minority students offer the possibility of expanding educational opportunities.

Policy decisions as well as unresolved issues of the 1970s will affect patterns of minority access to higher education in the 1980s. This chapter will discuss first the policy framework created by legislation and litigation on issues affecting student access. It will then examine three related questions that persist despite overall changes in higher education:

- increasing the pool of minority applicants;
- designing more equitable admission procedures;
- retaining minority students through graduation.

The next chapter will consider institutional responses to the question of minority student access.

Policy Parameters

Federal legislation. Federal laws in the 1960s and 1970s that affected the nature of higher education generally also set the framework for efforts to increase minority participation. In general, legislation involving the largest commitment of funds did not deal specifically with either minority students or minority institutions. Although both were affected, progress was not ensured against shifts in policies or priorities.

Until the 1960s, federal aid to education was directed primarily to institutions rather than to students. Although the National Defense Ed-

ucation Act of 1958 (P.L. 85-865) provided for student loans and graduate fellowships, the emphasis continued to be institutional development and subject specialization. The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (P.L. 88-204) similarly provided funds for classrooms, libraries, and laboratories that improved educational opportunities to students indirectly by aiding institutions directly.

The mid-1960s witnessed a transformation in federal involvement in higher education:

- The Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) stated that federal funds could not be provided to institutions that discriminated on the basis of race, including institutions of higher education.

- The Higher Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-329) not only provided institutional support, including Title III funds for developing institutions, but also expanded federal support of individual students through Basic and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (BEOG and SEOG).

Coupled with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-452) and the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-575), these acts signaled a basic shift from improving the quality of institutions of higher education to increasing the ability of all students to participate in postsecondary training (Conrad and Cosand 1976).

The introduction of direct student grants heralded shifts in both the magnitude and direction of federal involvement in higher education. Overall, federal aid to higher education increased from $2.1 billion in 1967 to $9.5 billion in 1977. During the same years, the share of appropriations for student support increased from about 48 percent to about 83 percent; the share for institutional support declined from about 50 percent to about 17 percent (NCES 1978a, pp. 200-201). These reductions were more severe for facilities and equipment than for current expenditures. Developing institutions, including historically black colleges, continued to receive direct aid through Title III, which will be discussed in the chapter on institutional concerns. Federal aid also shifted to the two-year college sector, which experienced the greatest enrollment gains. Since 1972, the share of federal aid to two-year colleges increased from 20 percent to 35 percent, and the share to undergraduate institutions declined from 58 percent to 52 percent and to graduate and professional programs from 23 percent to 14 percent (NCES 1978a, p. 200).

With its new emphasis on aid to students, federal assistance in higher education has grown astronomically both in dollar expenditures and in the number of students benefiting. Although higher education grants declined between 1977 and 1978, federal loans increased 260.2 percent (NCES 1979a, p. 29).

Changes in magnitude and emphasis have not been uniformly helpful to minority students. Long-established National Science Foundation (NSF)

and National Defense Education Act (NDEA) graduate fellowships, particularly in the sciences, were phased out just as concern for increasing minority involvement in those areas increased (Blake 1976, p. 197). Although minority families tend to be overly concentrated at low income levels, minority students were receiving a declining share of Basic and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants. The minority share of BEOGs dropped from 48.1 percent in 1974-75 to 42.1 percent in 1976-77; the share of SEOGs fell from 47.8 percent to 39.0 percent in the same period (NACBHE 1979a, p. 37). The participation of low-income students in State Student Incentive Grants fell, but participation of students from families earning more than $15,000 nearly doubled between 1974 and 1976. Similarly, the College Work/Study program affected fewer minority and low-income students than expected while the Graduate and Professional Opportunities program largely benefited white women.

The passage of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act (MISA) of 1978 (P.L. 95-566) accentuated a trend already underway whereby efforts to increase access affected middle-class rather than lower-class or minority students. Studies in the late 1970s seemed to indicate that growing costs for higher education were most adversely affecting students from middle-income families that did not qualify for federal grants or loans (Leslie 1977). Passed with broad-based support from educators, including those from minority groups, the Middle Income Student Assistance Act of 1978 raised the income eligibility requirement for BEOGs from $15,000 to $26,000, removed the income ceiling for Guaranteed Student Loans, (GSLs) and increased the funding threshholds for SEOGs and College Work/Study.

It is not yet clear how those changes will affect minority access to higher education. The formula controversies over the 1980 Education Amendments and the change in both the administration and control of the Senate threaten future uncertainties (Hook, Nov. 10, 1980, Jan. 26, April 6, April 13, 1981). Anticipated changes in federal funding for higher education seem aimed at reducing loans and grants to middle-income students. It is noteworthy, however, that funding determined by income level rather than racial or ethnic criteria has an unpredictable effect on minority participation. Some observers warn that the trend of trying to solve problems of a specific minority by broadening the field to include other groups makes potential solutions almost impossible to attain (NACBHE 1979a, p. 47).

Affirmative action. The major Supreme Court cases of the 1970s concerning minority access to higher education questioned the extent to which state universities could use race as a criterion of admission. Both the cases of *DeFunis* v. *Odegaard*, 416 U.S. 312 (1974), and *Regents of the University of California* v. *Bakke*, 438 U.S. 265 (1978),* involved voluntary affirmative action programs to increase minority enrollment in state-supported profes-

*The entire Supreme Court opinion in *Bakke* has been reprinted by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in its *Toward an Understanding of Bakke*.

sional schools. Coming as they did when progress in law and medical schools had already peaked, the cases became symbolic for minority educators of the waning commitment to minority concerns (Jones 1977; ISEP 1978).

Although the Supreme Court declared the *DeFunis* case moot, the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Douglas raised fundamental questions about the admissions process. In particular, Douglas reiterated the concerns of minority groups that standardized tests, such as the Law School Admissions Test (LSAT), embodied such cultural biases as to make them an inadequate gauge of a minority student's potential. At the same time, Justice Douglas warned of the dangers of reserving a proportion of places in a law school class for members of selected minority groups (416 U.S. 312, 337-40).

In the *Bakke* case, decided in 1978, the issue of a quota system for minority admissions was raised in the context of medical school admissions. The relatively new medical school at the University of California at Davis sought to increase its enrollment of minority students by reserving a specific number of places in the entering class for minority students. Minority applicants thus competed against each other for admission but not against white applicants.

The array of opinions reflected the complexity of the case itself and the controversy, even among educators, concerning the best way to increase minority participation in professional studies. The opinion of Justices Brennan, White, Marshall, and Blackman supported the use of racial classifications in university admissions; the opinion of Justices Stevens, Burger, Stewart, and Rehnquist found that the racial factor was not at issue and favored the admission of respondent Bakke. The opinion of Justice Powell, which drew from both wings of the court, concurred in the admission of Bakke and in the use of race as one factor in the admissions process, but rejected the use of racial quotas as a means to allocate seats and guarantee minority participation. This compromise position, which was criticized roundly by the NAACP and by other minority groups ("NAACP Chief" 1978) coincided with the recommendations of a number of educators and policy task forces (O'Neil 1975; Carnegie Council 1977b) and specifically described the admissions process at Harvard College. Since few programs had gone so far as Davis had in reserving seats according to race, the direct impact of the *Bakke* decision was less than the harmful uncertainty it had caused. In the acrimonious debate over "reverse discrimination," the symbolic importance of the case eclipsed its positive affirmation of the need to increase minority enrollment and the use of race as a means to accomplish it.

In the wake of *Bakke*, HEW issued a memorandum concluding that the case left intact its general regulations and its rules on women and the handicapped, its special programs for Indian and Alaskan natives, its bilingual education programs, and other efforts to help disadvantaged and minority students (Rich 1979). In October 1979, HEW's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) issued its Policy Interpretation of Antidiscrimination Reg-

ulations Under Title VI Including Affirmative Action for Clarification in Light of Bakke (U.S. Office for Civil Rights 1979).* The statement reiterated that the federal government encouraged voluntary affirmative action admissions programs to overcome the effects of conditions limiting minority-group participation and to attain a diverse student body. OCR noted that, according to *Bakke*, a fixed number of positions could not be set aside for which nonminority students could not compete; nor could race be the sole criterion of selection. Nevertheless, its interpretation suggested numerous ways in which race or ethnicity could be a positive factor in increasing minority participation. Such voluntary action could include:

- consideration of race as one criterion in selecting students;
- increased recruiting efforts in minority institutions and communities;
- use of alternative admissions criteria when traditional criteria inadequately predict student success;
- provision of preadmission compensatory and tutorial programs;
- establishment and pursuit of numerical goals to achieve the racial and ethnic composition of the student body the institution seeks.

Similarly, after *Bakke*, academic institutions and interest groups reconsidered admissions procedures to provide sufficient flexibility to comply with the law yet provide adequate zeal to ensure the enrollment of minority students (ACE-AALS Committee on Bakke 1978; Astin 1978).

In February 1981, the California Supreme Court, reversing a lower court decision, upheld a "race conscious" admissions program at the law school of the University of California at Davis. The decision specifically relied on the opinion by Justice Powell in *Bakke* and approved the use of race as one factor in promoting institutional diversity without the use of quotas (Jacobson, Feb. 23, 1980, p. 4).

Access Issues

Increasing minority enrollment. The failure to achieve enrollment parity for minority students at all levels of higher education suggests untapped sources of potential growth. The central educational issue posed by the *DeFunis* and *Bakke* cases concerns the undergraduate level as well: how to increase the number and proportion of students from traditionally underrepresented minority groups.

As suggested in the chapter on trends, access can be viewed as a continuum. The size and quality of the minority applicant pool for graduate and professional schools are determined by the quality of participation, rates of retention, and graduation at the four-year college level. These, in turn, are affected by a configuration of factors that determine if a student completes high school and seeks further education. Many of the same conclusions that govern if and where a student will attend college also

* The text was also reprinted in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 15, 1979.

influence the likelihood that the student will remain until graduation. These factors include the student's socioeconomic status, ability, preparation, aspirations, and financial assistance (NCES 1977, p. 92).

Writers have identified potential sources of new minority students by geographical location, measured ability level, and family income. Despite out-migration to other parts of the country, the South retains a large number of black youth (Blake 1976, p. 194). Data presented in the chapter on access trends suggest that southern states recently have surpassed national averages in increasing the enrollment of black students. Because most of the nation's historically black public and private colleges are in the South, those states also have some experience with blacks in higher education. In contrast, the need to provide higher educational opportunities for Hispanic students is a newer problem. Some commentators have observed that the Hispanic community lacks a network of institutions comparable to the historically black colleges. (Smith 1977, p. 169).

Urban areas represent the other major source of potential minority students, particularly blacks and Hispanics. Since low-income and minority families are heavily concentrated in cities, their children experience the educational disadvantages of large public school systems (Blake 1976, p. 201). These disadvantages include high rates of suspension and expulsion, discriminatory placement in special education programs, inadequate counseling, poor academic preparation, and lack of encouragement (NACBHE 1979a, pp. xii-xiii; NCES 1978a, p. 134; NAACP 1976, p. 1).

The geographic area from which a minority student is drawn may affect not only the student's choice of a college but also his or her ability to succeed there. This relationship requires more study. Blake (1976, p. 194) notes that in 1970, 36 percent of the black high school population was still in rural areas. Commuter colleges may not be appropriate for a scattered rural population, but alternatives have not been well considered. Similarly, Hispanic youths from rural areas may have different needs from their urban counterparts. Colleges that are just becoming aware of the peculiar needs of Hispanic students (National Institute 1976) must also be sensitive to the experiential differences between urban and rural youths. In addition, commuter colleges offer a less intensive educational experience that may be less advantageous than the opportunities provided by a residential college for full-time students. (Astin 1975; Olivas 1979).

As higher education generally has moved away from an elitist orientation, its area of service has expanded first to lower-income students of high measured ability and increasingly to students at all levels on the income and ability scales who might benefit from some postsecondary education. Surveys of high school seniors show that interest in entering some form of educational program after high school varies with race or Spanish origin, family income, and years of schooling of the family head. In 1979, the proportion of seniors planning to attend college was 40.5 percent among blacks, 47.8 percent among Hispanics, and 49.4 percent among whites. Of students from families earning more than $25,000, 81.2 percent planned to attend college compared to 37.0 percent of students

from families earning under $5,000. In families where the head had four years or more of college, the expectation was 77.5 percent compared to 31.6 percent where the family head had less than eight years of schooling. On the other hand, students planning to attend vocational school tended to come more from lower-income families where the family head had less education (NCES 1978a, p. 108).

Interest in attending college revealed quite a different pattern from plans for attending college. A larger proportion of black students surveyed in 1975 indicated an interest in further education than did Hispanics or whites. In addition, groups with incomes under $5,000 and with low levels of family-head schooling indicated greater interest than did students from higher income groups (NCES 1978a, p. 110). Since interest and motivation are related both to college admission and retention, this is a hopeful sign.

Income trends are less encouraging. College attendance correlates with both income and family educational attainment. Figures issued by the National Urban League in 1980 showed that blacks had lost ground to whites economically since 1970. In 1970, the average black family income was 61 percent of the average white, but in 1978 this figure had shrunk to 59 percent. The average incomes of both white and black families had increased, but the white income increased proportionately more, thus widening the gap. Black unemployment and the number of blacks below the poverty line also grew (National Urban League 1980; Rich, Jan. 23 1980, p. A1). Similarly, in terms of educational attainment, larger numbers of blacks continue to graduate from college. But as higher education experienced overall growth, white progress outpaced black. Starting from behind, blacks need to make greater-than-average progress in income and educational gains in order to achieve parity.

Financial need, defined as the difference between the costs of education and the student's and family's ability to pay for those costs (Fleming 1975, p. 29), is one of the chief barriers to minority participation in higher education. Researchers have found that low-income students differ from higher-income students not only in economic need but also in motivation, aspiration, and parental expectation (NCES 1977, p. 87). Studies indicate that race or ethnicity is having a decreasing impact on participation in higher education than is socioeconomic status (Jencks 1979, p. 214; NCES 1977, p. 37). The patterns are increasingly complex. Among those observed are the following:

- Students from higher-income families are more likely to enroll in college preparatory programs. At all income levels, students from non-college preparatory programs are more likely to withdraw (NCES 1977, p. 970). But since low-income minorities are disproportionately found in noncollege preparatory programs, the effect on them is greater (NACBHE 1979a, p. 6).

- Minority and income status when correlated may produce minority outcomes that exceed white. Among 18-to-24-year-olds, at income levels

between $5,000 and $19,000, the college enrollment rate of blacks exceeds that of whites and Hispanics (NCES 1978a, pp. 122-23). After controlling for socioeconomic status, whites were more likely than Hispanics to withdraw (NCES 1977, p. 55)

- Among students followed in the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972, those who received financial aid had lower withdrawal rates than those who did not (NCES 1978a, pp. 134-135). Also, they were more likely to receive their degrees without interruption (NCES 1978a, pp. 136-37).

- Financial aid proved crucial to minority participation at the four-year college level where ethnicity was significantly related to the withdrawal rate when socioeconomic status was taken into account (NCES 1977, p. 37).

Financial aid is a matter that is determined by the potential student's economic need before entering higher education. Studies show that financial assistance affects both the student's choice of college and the likelihood of remaining until graduation. Like the choice of a college preparation course, counseling for minority students on available loans and grants is crucial not only for college entry but to success once enrolled.

A minority student's measured ability, combined with the family's socioeconomic status, adds another factor to the complex equation of access. Virtually all the literature shows a correlation between scores on standardized tests and student income level (Doermann 1978, p. 38; NACBHE 1979a, p. 8). Crossland reports that the mean scores of minority youth on standardized aptitude or achievement tests is about one standard deviation below the mean score for the rest of the population. Thus, such test scores, even if used without discrimination, constitute a major barrier (1971, pp. 58-59; Smith 1977, p. 35).

Data from the National Longitudinal Study were used to plot college enrollment rates by race and measured ability. The findings seemed to show that a higher proportion of black students than white students in the lower two quartiles of measured ability enrolled in higher education (U.S. Congressional Budget Office 1977, p. 32). Doermann estimates that 200,000 additional students of moderate ability could be enrolled from low- or low/middle-income groups. Although a majority of these are white, a significant proportion are black, Hispanic, and American Indian (Doermann 1978, p. 11). As a group they are described as potentially benefiting from further education but lacking the necessary funds.

Doermann defines the pool in terms of Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores in the 200-299 and 300-449 range and in income brackets of less than $8,680 and between $8,680 and $14,100. He estimates on the basis of National Longitudinal Survey data that 40 percent of the students in these categories are black (Doermann 1978, p. 39). Of these groups, Doermann estimates that 120,000 could be drawn from the 300-449 bracket

and enrolled without substantial changes in academic programs, but 80,000 drawn from the 200-299 bracket would necessitate new programs in counseling and basic skills. Doermann's estimations coincide with the observations of Blake (1976, p. 199) that even enrolling all the brightest and highest-achieving black youth would not be sufficient for black participation to keep pace. "Not nearly enough is being done to enroll many of these youths who are survivors of the pre-college system with considerable personal and academic strengths."

Designing more equitable admissions procedures. Analysis, such as that by Doermann, suggests new ways to increase the numbers of minority students from previously neglected sources. At the same time, however, it assumes some degree of validity of the scores of standardized tests on which it is based. The controversy surrounding the *DeFunis* and *Bakke* cases merely highlighted a long-standing debate over the role of test scores in the admissions process.

Testing affects educational choices at all levels. The new wave of competence testing is a double-edged sword. If used at lower grade levels to provide an early warning of academic deficiencies, it can help boost the skills and secondary school records of minority students. If, on the other hand, it is used solely as a final step to high school graduation, it can diminish the minority pool of eligible high school seniors. Early experience indicates that minorities have disproportionate rates of failures on this kinds of competence test (NACBHE 1979a, pp. 8-9). The uncritical and unstudied use of standardized test scores to predict minority student success has been widely criticized. (Crossland 1971, p. 58; NAACP 1976; Smith 1977, p. 35).

George Temp has referred to the use of objective test scores and high school grades to predict success as the "psychometric barrier to higher education" (Miller 1974, p. 30). In using test scores to reduce the size of the applicant pool, admissions officers inevitably exclude students who could do the work adequately if admitted. Organizations, such as the NAACP, are particularly concerned that standardized tests used for college, graduate, and professional school admission fail to reflect the cultural plurality of American society. Because tests are devised without the guidance of minority professionals and performance is measured against majority norms, the tests embody built-in biases against minority students (NAACP 1976, p. 11).

Over the last decade, scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test have dropped nationwide among all students. The National Assessment of Educational Progress, however, in its third survey of writing skills, found that black students, ages 13 to 17, had improved either absolutely or relatively on writing tasks (Scully 1981); Hispanic youth did not show similar gains. (Morgan 1981). In addition to verbal and mathematical skills, writing ability is crucial to advancement through the educational hierarchy. Preliminary plans for restructuring the Law School Admission Test (LSAT) call for inclusion of an unscored writing sample or exercise to be sent to

each law school to which a candidate applies ("LSAT to be Restructured" 1981).

A number of alternative approaches have been suggested to minimize the deleterious effects on standardized tests and increase the competitive standing of minority students. Studies suggest that reliance on other criteria would not undermine the validity of admissions decisions. Analysis of the National Longitudinal Study data indicates that high school grade-point average is a better indicator of college success than are standardized test scores (NCES 1977, p. 92). Also, among low-income students, high aspiration can be crucial to persistence until graduation (NCES 1977, p. 88).

Steps to remedy unfairness to minority students by standardized testing range from making tests better to scrapping them altogether:

- *Better tests.* The NAACP recommends the involvement of more minority professionals in the design of tests and the evaluation of results. Also, it favors research into testing itself, including predictive validity, cultural bias, the relation between the time factor and test results, and the setting of norms.

- *Testing laws.* Consumer advocates (Nader and Narin 1978) and minority groups advocate "truth-in-testing" legislation regulating the testing industry. Included are provisions for making available information on test usage, norms, and performance by various subgroups and for providing copies of questions and answers to individual test-takers. Such a law, in effect in New York State, prompted a cutback in the number of test dates and an increase in test fees ("College Board," October 15, 1979, p. 2). A similar law, The Educational Testing Act of 1979, H.R. 4949, was introduced by Congressman Ted Weiss (D-N.Y.) in the first session of the 96th Congress, and although hearings were held, it was not voted on.

- *Use of alternative admissions criteria.* The opinion of Justice Powell in *Bakke*, the policy interpretation by the Office for Civil Rights, and the writings of such scholars as Robert O'Neil all suggest a lessened reliance on test scores. This approach recognizes that a minority student brings strengths not necessarily reflected in test scores and acknowledges the benefits to all students of a diverse student body. Motivation and life experiences are among the factors to be considered (SREB 1976).

- *Improvement of test-taking skills.* The poor performance of minority students on standardized tests also may indicate a lack of experience with the testing procedure. If regarded as another academic skill, test-taking ability may be improved by practice. The public school system of the District of Columbia required all high school sophomores to take the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) in the fall of 1980.

Students, whose fees were paid by the school system, gained experience in taking the exam, which is usually taken in the junior year. Results of the test, including an item-by-item analysis, will be used to determine areas of academic weakness and to modify curriculum (Cooke 1980).

- *Scrap offensive tests altogether.* In 1979, a group of black and Hispanic job applicants sued the Office of Personnel Management, asking that the Professional Administrative Career Examination (PACE) for civil service jobs be abolished because of biases against blacks and Hispanics. They sought a new test that would guarantee that a much higher proportion of minority applicants passed and obtained government employment. (Rich, Dec. 6, 1980) In February 1981, an agreement was reached under which the PACE will be phased out over three years and new tests will be specifically designed to fit the qualifications needed for different sets of jobs (Rich 1981).

The testing issue thus spans all levels from high school graduation through admission to graduate school and entry into the job market. If used uncritically or without sensitivity to immeasurable qualities such as character and motivation, tests can constitute a major barrier to minority participation in higher education and beyond.

A major alternative to the traditional admissions procedure, even one using flexible criteria to ensure the increased participation of minorities, is the concept of open admissions. In his deposition in the case of *Adams* v. *Richardson*, educator Elias Blake, Jr., advocated open admissions as a means to desegregation; "It means simply that a student who has graduated from high school in good standing should be entitled to enroll in an institution of higher education in that same state" (1971, p. 111). At the National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks in 1972, Blake described open enrollment as involving admission on the basis of high school graduation with a C-average to any public college, not just a community college, without additional criteria such as specific test score, grade-point average, or class rank (National Policy Conference 1972, p. 121). Further, graduation from a community college would ensure admission to a four-year state college; graduation from a four-year college with a C + average and an appropriate major would ensure admission to law, medical, dental, or graduate school. Experience with open admissions, as with special minority admissions programs (Moore 1978; Gross 1980), suggests that inability of faculty to adjust to nontraditional students undermines efforts of minority students to persist through to graduation.

Retaining minority students. As discussed earlier, many of the factors that determine if and where a student goes to college also influence whether that student stays to complete the course. The problem of retention concerns all students, but affects minority students in more complex and particular ways. The National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 revealed these general retention patterns (NCES 1977, p. 37):

- Although half the class of 1972 entered some type of institution of higher education within two years of graduation, almost one-third of the entrants withdrew during the same period.
- More students dropped out of two-year than four-year colleges.
- More students dropped out for nonacademic than academic reasons.
- More freshmen than sophomores dropped out. A majority of those returning for a third year went on to graduate.
- Proportionately more students dropped out of four-year public than four-year private colleges. There was little difference, however, between public and private two-year colleges.
- The rate of dropping out did not vary with instructional size but did vary with academic selectivity. More selective colleges had less problem retaining students.

In each of these categories, the implications for minority students are clear. Access patterns show that black, Hispanic, and other minority students are overrepresented in schools with greater retention problems generally: two-year colleges, public institutions, and less selective programs. Furthermore, since a larger proportion of minority students are from low-income families requiring financial aid or are older, independent students with job and family responsibilities, they are more vulnerable to non-academic pressures forcing withdrawal. Among racial and ethnic groups, studies find blacks most likely to withdraw; whites and orientals appear less likely to withdraw than Hispanics, blacks, or American Indians (NCES 1977, p. 55). The differences among ethnic groups are not as sharp, however, as differences among socioeconomic groups. Especially at the four-year college level is ethnicity significantly related to withdrawal rate when the income factor is taken into account.

The problem of retention has institutional implications that affect all students at risk of dropping out as well as more specific implications related to particular ethnic groups, particular fields of study, and, finally, particular students.

Campus environment is a factor that affects all students, but it affects minority students more acutely. Studies show that students who have withdrawn often cite the hostile racial climate as an important reason (Morris 1979). A recent resurgence of racial incidents on campuses has caused concern nationwide (Middleton, Jan. 12, 1981). Observers report that faculty, especially in senior colleges and research institutions, often have negative attitudes toward remedial students and are poorly prepared to teach them (Gross 1980; Moore 1978). This is believed to reinforce students' negative self-image and to undermine their expectations.

A substantial presence on campus of minority group faculty members is fundamental to improving campus environments. The shortage of black and Hispanic instructors at two-year colleges is a particular problem. (Smith 1877, p. 153; Olivas 1979, p. 176). Work with low-income or minority students also may suffer if remedial programs are inadequately financed, superficial, lack permanence or institutional support, and are

viewed as outside the institution's central purpose (Moore 1978; Peterson et al. 1978). Educators also must be sensitive to the different needs of individual ethnic groups (National Institute 1976; Olivas 1978, 1979).

As the concept of access has expanded, concerns also have become more specific. This is illustrated by the number of retention efforts that have been designed to attract and retain students in particular fields where minority participation historically has been low. At the undergraduate level, special programs in scientific and technical fields have made some progress (SREB 1980).

Ultimately, retention is measured not only campus-wide or by ethnic group or by discipline, but by the individual student's ability to successfully complete the course best suited to his or her needs and abilities. The latest and most promising direction in the retention field now centers on the use of computer analysis to indicate at an early point when a student needs more individual assistance or counseling. Pioneered at the University of Illinois-Chicago Circle, data-driven models for retention track students in special admissions categories in entry courses that might prove difficult. By monitoring performance early in the academic semester, the system alerts counselors and advisors when a student might benefit from additional help (Goodrich 1980; Committee on Institutional Cooperation 1980).

At every level in the educational hierarchy from high school on, the particular needs of minority students must be identified and met with creative and flexible responses. Minority students bring to higher education different problems of preparation and financial need, but also bring different strengths of cultural heritage and life experience. To maximize the participation of minority students, educators need to acknowledge and capitalize on these strengths while applying economic and academic assistance at the appropriate level and in the particular field to the individual student.

Institutional Concerns

Many of the same factors that prompted universities to adopt affirmative action programs to increase minority enrollment also resulted in new initiatives to further desegregation in formerly segregated systems of public higher education. Affirmative action and desegregation overlap in their focus on expanding the numbers and proportion of minority students at all levels of higher education. Both have been affected by changing degrees of federal government commitment and by waning support for civil rights efforts generally (Jones 1977). There are significant differences, however.

- Geographically, the drive for affirmative action is nationwide although the move for desegregation is concentrated in the formerly segregated southern and border states.

- Legally, the affirmative action compliance is mandated for faculty hiring, as provided by E.O. 11246 (1965), governing the employment practices of federal government contractors. Affirmative action for minority student recruitment, as at issue in the *DeFunis* and *Bakke* cases, is voluntary. Standards for desegregation, involving both faculty and students, are derived from Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and from the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

- Affirmative action, under E.O. 11246, affects both public and private institutions that receive federal government contracts. Desegregation decisions affect only publicly supported higher education.

- Suits challenging affirmative action plans generally have been initiated by white applicants claiming that such efforts have gone too far. Desegregation suits generally have been filed by black applicants, students, or faculty alleging that enforcement efforts by federal or state officials have not gone far enough.

- Affirmative action now embraces numerous underrepresented groups: blacks, Hispanics, other ethnic groups, women, and the handicapped. The traditional concern of desegregation efforts has been the education of black students.

- The focus of affirmative action has been increasing minority participation in traditionally white institutions. The definition of desegregation has expanded to consider the racial identity of historically black colleges.

- Desegregation involves institutional considerations that are outside the bounds of affirmative action.

Efforts to desegregate higher education antedated the concept of affirmative action. Even after the *Brown* decision was applied to higher education in the 1950s, however, social and economic factors kept minority

students from enrolling in large numbers at white institutions. The same nonlegal barriers of economic disadvantage, inadequate secondary preparation, cultural isolation, and poor counseling affected minority students in formerly segregated and non-segregated states alike (Willie and Edmonds 1978). In formerly segregated states, however, legal restrictions based on race had institutionalized enrollment patterns along racial lines. As desegregation efforts proceeded, the vestiges of these dual systems of higher education became increasingly important. The legal status and educational role of black public colleges, in particular, have become the central dilemma of desegregation in higher education (Egerton 1971).

The Federal Role

It is crucial to distinguish between efforts to assist individual students and those to affect institutional patterns of enrollment or development. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, educators, civil rights leaders, and government officials were caught in the crosscurrents of these efforts. As noted earlier, federal aid to higher education since the 1950s had flowed to institutions rather than to individual students. With the introduction of the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants, however, the course of funding was shifted from institutions to students. The major exception to this change, as will be discussed later, was Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, providing funds for "developing institutions."

While the federal government moved from direct to indirect institutional aid, new civil rights efforts developed an increasingly institutional focus. From the early 1930s, suits to desegregate state universities and graduate and professional schools involved single well-qualified black plaintiffs seeking admission. When even major legal victories, however, brought only small gains in the numbers of black students enrolled, a new generation of lawsuits sought institutional changes. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 gave major impetus to this new thrust. It provided an administrative, as well as judicial, method to terminate federal funds going to institutions that discriminated on the basis of race. During the Johnson administration, a new Office for Civil Rights was created within HEW to separate the enforcement aspects of Title VI from the administrative and policy-making aspects of aid to higher education.

The suit of *Adams* v. *Richardson* represented an entirely new litigative effort to desegregate education. It was initiated in reaction to an announcement by officials of the Nixon administration that administrative enforcement of Title VI would be abandoned in favor of judicial proceedings on a case-by-case basis. This about-face countered both the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which documented the need for a speedy alternative to protracted court action, and subsequent findings that public school desegregation had made major progress only after Title VI threatened the loss of federal funds.

As filed by the NAACP Legal Defense Fund in October 1970, *Adams* v. *Richardson* differed markedly from earlier suits to desegregate higher education:

- Plaintiffs were not qualified black applicants seeking admission to state-supported institutions of higher education but were citizens and students from several states.
- Defendant was not a single state university, but the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
- The relief requested was not admission to a specific school but enforcement by federal officials of Title VI and "action to discontinue Federal financial assistance to all public colleges and universities practicing racial segregation or discrimination" (Haynes 1978, p. A-18).
- Higher education issues were not defined separately but were stated in conjunction with the failure to enforce public school desegregation.

Because the suit was framed in procedural terms, the lower court was able to rule in plaintiff's behalf on a motion for summary judgment without a full trial. Judge John H. Pratt found that between January 1969 and Febraury 1970, HEW had notified ten states that they were operating segregated systems of higher education in violation of Title VI and had requested state desegregation plans. Half of the ten, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, North Carolina, and Florida, had ignored the request and submitted no plans. Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Georgia, Maryland, and Virginia had submitted unacceptable plans. HEW had not commented on unacceptable plans or initiated administrative or judicial proceedings. Judge Pratt's order of February 16, 1973, ordered HEW to commence enforcement proceedings within 120 days and to report on its efforts at intervals.

Defining Desegregation

Because of their emphasis on procedure, both the pleadings of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and Judge Pratt's decision left undefined the substantive meaning of desegregation in public higher education. Plaintiffs assumed that desegregation at the public school level and in higher education presented basically the same problems to which the same legal standards applied. Legal decisions and administrative guidelines for public schools called for the elimination of racial identifiability in public education and the creation of "just schools." States were held to have an affirmative duty to overcome the vestigial aspects of dual school systems based on race.

In its earliest stages, parties in the *Adams* litigation viewed the central problem to be remaining patterns of black and white enrollment in formerly segregated states. Both HEW, in its initial findings, and the Legal Defense Fund, in its allegations, cited the continuing racial distribution of students in black and white public colleges. In most formerly segregated states, traditionally white colleges enrolled fewer than 10 percent minority students, and historically black public colleges enrolled even smaller proportions of white students (Egerton 1969). This perspective dealt with enrollment patterns and statistics in gross terms. No data showed the numbers of blacks applying to white schools or whites applying to black schools or the respective ratio of acceptances or rejections.

In this view, the continued existence of public black colleges appeared to be part of the problem. Following the pattern of public school desegregation suits, equality of educational opportunity was gauged by the extent to which black students were able to enroll in majority white institutions. Neither HEW nor the Legal Defense Fund considered the economic and social considerations that continued to draw black students to black colleges or regarded black colleges as an important component in state systems of higher education.

Although the legal status and educational role of historically black colleges did not take center stage until late in the *Adams* case, the issues were of long-standing importance. Educational and philanthropic groups had documented the extent to which black colleges had trained generations of graduates with meager funds and scant state support (McGrath 1965; Carnegie Commission 1971; Southern Education Foundation 1972). Just as HEW and the Legal Defense Fund called for the elimination of racial identifiability in higher education, the wave of the black-power movement on campuses made institutions run by and for black people newly relevant (LeMelle and LeMelle 1969; "The Future" 1971).

Integration, which once had been viewed as the chief means of improving the educational opportunity of black students, increasingly was regarded as a threat to black colleges and to the students they traditionally served (Egerton 1971; *Beyond Desegregation* 1978). The particular concern of black colleges entered the *Adams* case initially through the deposition of Elias Blake, Jr. (1971) and later through an amicus brief submitted to the appellate court by the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO), representing the presidents of the nation's historical and newer predominantly black colleges (Haynes 1978). Blake provided substantive guidance for appraising state higher education desegregation plans. He presented a strong case for the continued role of black public colleges, stressing the diverse nature of institutional roles required to meet diverse student needs. He made clear that desegregation in higher education required more than shifting the racial composition of enrollment on college campuses. He warned that unless a state could show that its plan would increase both the number and proportion of blacks throughout the system, "then you run the risk of desegregating a system and at the same time possibly diminishing the number of places in the system that are now for blacks" (Blake 1971, p. 90).

Like Blake, NAFEO argued that the racial identity of institutions was not the problem but rather a symptom of the more fundamental question of access. Black colleges endured because they provided access to higher education for students who might not have attended college at all, either because of poor academic preparation or economic obstacles. NAFEO's brief (Haynes 1978) went beyond statistics to the substance of the educational process, arguing that the demonstrated success of black colleges in serving the educational needs of black students should not be sacrificed to the unproved advantages of integration.

The opinion by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit

issued in June 1973 set the legal standard for desegregating higher education (480 F.2d 1159 [D.C. Cir. 1973]). The Court called on HEW to proceed with efforts to enforce Title VI in higher education but also recognized the federal government's inexperience in the area and the newly-apparent complexity of the problem. Two of its concerns, which particularly affected black colleges and minority access, were later singled out by Blake as the decision's most lasting contributions (J. Smith 1981):

- The need for statewide planning to provide more and better trained minority group doctors, lawyers, engineers, and other professionals.
- The need for a viable coordinated statewide higher education policy that takes into account the special problem of minority students and of black colleges.

By incorporating the concerns of NAFEO in its decision, the Court acknowledged the complexity of the concept of access, the continued importance of black colleges, and the crucial role of statewide planning in increasing the numbers and proportion of black students at all levels.

Implementing Change

The desegregation plans received by HEW in November 1973 were largely unacceptable because of their lack of detail and their failure to gauge the impact on desegregation of the actions they proposed. Since then, the criteria for acceptable state plans have become increasingly specific; at the same time the definition of desegregation has become increasingly broad. This pattern parallels that of the concept of minority access to higher education itself which, as we have seen, has expanded to include new groups and concerns while it has become more particular in its measures of success.

In 1974, shortly before the so-called *Adams* states were expected to submit further revisions, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund submitted an implementation memo to HEW suggesting components of acceptable state plans. Many of these mirrored goals and techniques already proposed or adopted for increasing minority enrollments generally. Among them were:

- Establishing the goal of approximate proportional representation of minorities at every level throughout a system of higher education, including governing boards and administrative personnel and staff, reflecting the diversity of the state's racial and cultural groups.
- Specifying measures, including modified admissions criteria, recruitment efforts, and compensatory programs to increase the number of black students entering and graduating from formerly white schools.
- Enhancing historically black colleges by program development and increased funding.

HEW responded to the 1974 state plans with requests for additional modifications, which were to include:

- Conducting comparative analyses of resources at state colleges, both black and white, including facilities, per capita expenditures, student aid, library holdings, faculty quality, programs, and degree offerings.
- Stating the institutional role of each institution in non-racial terms, with black schools assigned roles comparable to other institutions.
- Developing formats to eliminate unnecessary duplication of courses, programs, and degrees between proximate black and white colleges.

These requirements were remarkably similar to the recommendations of the Commission on Higher Educational Opportunity in the South, developed with a concern for educational improvement rather than desegregation (1967).

Although states were called upon to take a variety of steps to increase white enrollment at predominantly black schools and black enrollment at predominantly white schools, it was not clear what measures actually would succeed. Academic traditionalism coupled with historic racial separation combined to make demands for rapid progress in the first years of state plans unrealistic. The plans approved by HEW in June 1974 were criticized for their inadequacies (Egerton 1974). The lack of uniform, well-publicized standards, the backroom negotiations between individual states and HEW officials, the enormous bulk of the plans themselves, and the lack of uniformity in their formats made it almost impossible to evaluate or compare the plans (Mohr 1976, pp. 27-69). Responding to particular state needs, the 1974 plans shared a number of similar approaches:

- Recruitment of "other race" students by improved financial aid, more congenial campus environments, and modified admissions requirements.
- Retention efforts such as remedial programs and better counseling.
- Efforts to eliminate program and degree duplication, but usually limited to studies of the problem rather than commitments to take action.
- Promises to upgrade historically black colleges, but without commitments to place important new programs on black campuses.

Although the whole process of desegregation in higher education proved infinitely more complex than plaintiffs, courts, educators, and state and federal officials envisioned, the Legal Defense Fund returned to court in August 1975 demanding further relief (Haynes 1978). It charged that plans accepted in 1974 fell short on every criterion, including modified admissions requirements to increase black enrollment at prestigious white universities, reassignment of staff to increase black faculty on white campuses, elimination of program duplication at neighboring institutions, the inclusion of blacks on governing boards, and the enhancement of black institutions. Judge Pratt took no action in the plaintiff's Motion for Further Relief until January 1977 when the Legal Defense Fund submitted a deposition by Martin Gerry, outgoing head of the Office for Civil Rights.

Gerry's testimony made clear that OCR's efforts to enforce Title VI in higher education were hampered by a lack of detailed, uniformly applicable guidelines. As a result, Judge Pratt ordered HEW to prepare final criteria specifying the ingredients of an acceptable higher education desegregation plan by July 1977 (Haynes 1978).

As developed by OCR in consultation with educators, civil rights groups, and state officials, the Amended Criteria require both direct efforts to increase the number and proportion of minority students and institutional changes to affect indirectly student access. Among the criteria for desegregation of student enrollment are:

- Adopting the goal that equal proportions of white and black high school seniors would enter undergraduate schools.
- Adopting the goal that equal proportions of white and black college graduates would enter graduate and professional training.
- Adopting measures to reduce the disparity between the proportion of white and black students graduating at each level.
- Adopting measures to reduce the disparity between the proportion of white and black students in four-year colleges and upper-division courses (U.S. Office for Civil Rights 1978).

The criteria mentioned reviewing, monitoring, or revising procedures for student recruitment and admissions, compensatory instruction, counseling, and financial aid.

Formulations for increased white enrollment on black campuses were delayed to increase the total number of black students in higher education and to strenghten traditionally black colleges by the location of new programs and the elimination of program duplication.

HEW opposed using quotas or lowering academic standards in order to meet enrollment or retention goals. It recommended instead the use of innovative methods to discover talented students, broadened definitions of potential, and considerations of early disadvantage in the development of academic skills.

The sections of the Amended Criteria calling for commitments to disestablish the structure of dual systems of higher education represented an institutional approach with uncertain prospects for student access. The overall goal was defined as operating institutions and systems of higher education in such a way as to ensure that students would be attracted to a school on the basis of its educational programs and opportunities uninhibited by past practices of segregation (U.S. Office for Civil Rights 1978). Black public colleges and universities were most affected by these requirements:

- Defining the mission of each state institution in terms of function, including the level of instruction, the range and scope of degree programs, the geographic area served, and the projected size.
- Strengthening the role of traditionally black colleges by commit-

ments to upgrade their resources, faculty, programs, and facilities until comparable to traditionally white schools with similar missions.

- Giving priority to traditionally black colleges as the site for new undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs, consistent with their mission.
- Taking action to eliminate unnecessary program duplication among traditionally black and white colleges in the same service area.

The question of unnecessary program duplication constitutes one of the great unresolved issues in the desegregation of higher education. Beyond agreement that certain undergraduate subjects constitute a core curriculum basic to any institution, there is little consensus as to the meaning of either "unnecessary" or "duplication." Experience in at least one state seems to show that the location of unduplicated programs does not influence student choice (Maryland State Board 1977). On the other hand, locating the new state school of architecture at Florida A. & M. University seemed to attract white students to that historically black campus and to increase the number of black students in the field of architecture.

Even more difficult are the problems posed when neighboring black and white colleges conduct overlapping programs. The merger of Tennessee State University and the University of Tennessee at Nashville (Ivey 1980) provides one model for eliminating duplication between neighboring black and white institutions. The transfer of education and business programs between Savannah State and Albany State in Georgia illustrates a less drastic alternative. In that case, however, black plaintiffs have filed suit seeking a merger of white Albany State into historically black Savannah State. Institutional cooperation, including cross-registration, provides a third model in effect in the Norfolk area between Norfolk State and Old Dominion University (Godard 1980). The question of program duplication between black and white institutions is central to the suit by North Carolina* against efforts by the federal government to cut off federal aid for failure to comply with desegregation guidelines.

Although the Amended Criteria provided the most explicit guidelines for desegregation in public higher education, their effectiveness depended on often uncontrolled factors and a changing cast of characters, particularly at the federal level. The extent to which either direct measures to increase the numbers and proportion of minority students or institutional changes succeeded in expanding educational opportunities remained subject to economic conditions and political currents affecting all higher education.

Limiting Factors

From the late 1960s, fragmentation has hampered efforts by the federal government to press for further desegregation. Only ten states were orig-

*State of North Carolina v. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, No. 79-217-CIV-S (E.D. N.C. June 8, 1979).

inally cited for being in violation of Title VI although other southern states maintained higher education systems that also were divided along racial lines. As the *Adams* litigation progressed, even those ten states were handled differently. Mississippi and Louisiana, which failed to submit satisfactory plans early in the process, are being sued separately by the Justice Department. Maryland sued HEW over a procedural question; Pennsylvania is said to be negotiating a separate settlement. North Carolina balked over the issue of unnecessary program duplication and is now the subject of an administrative fact-finding hearing. Florida, Georgia, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Virginia are operating under approved plans. As reported, however, enrollment drops among black students in these states threatened the attainment of their desegregation goals (Middleton, Jan 21, 1980). Ironically, states that had proceeded furthest in the desegregation process also were in greater danger of falling short.

On December 17, 1980, Judge Pratt signed a consent order in the *Adams* case requiring the Department of Education to complete seven pending compliance investigations by January 15, 1981 (Institute for Services to Education 1981). The findings for West Virginia and Missouri indicated that substantial strides had been made; these states must increase efforts to recruit black students and faculty to major white campuses. The Office for Civil Rights requested statewide desegregation plans, within 90 days, from Alabama, South Carolina, Delaware, and Kentucky and announced the provisional acceptance of a plan submitted by Texas. Findings on compliance efforts in Ohio are due by April 15, 1981. Under the terms of the consent order, the Office for Civil Rights has 30 days to comment on proposed state higher education desegregation plans.

The negotiations leading up to the consent order followed the 1980 presidential election. The change of administrations has added an element of uncertainty to the process. The incoming Secretary of Education, Terrel Bell, promised a shift in desegregation policy. In an address to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in March 1981, Bell hinted at easing deadlines for compliance and returning to negotiations (Brown 1981).

Funding is another factor of crucial importance to desegregation efforts, particularly to the upgrading of historically black colleges. As discussed in the chapter on student concerns, minority students received a share that was less than expected of federal student aid. Similarly, historically black colleges received a diminishing proportion of funds allocated under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 for developing institutions. Although the legislative history of the act shows that black colleges were the intended recipients, new community colleges have claimed a growing share (NACBHE 1979b, p. 63). The National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities has recommended that Title III be made specifically applicable to historically black colleges (NACBHE 1979a, p. 63). Olivas has suggested that Congress require separate administration of Title III funds to two-year and black colleges or transfer development of two-year colleges from Title III to Title X, "Es-

tablishment and Expansion of Community Colleges," of the Higher Education Act of 1965. (Olivas 1979, pp. 172-73).

Several well-publicized incidents involving Title III recently have called the appropriation into question, but a study of black college presidents reveals that recipient institutions considered the funds crucial for program and faculty development (Fincher 1980).

At the state level, desegregation efforts are subject to changing economic fortunes and political commitments. The criteria did not specify fund allocation requirements or mandate that new programs be located on traditionally black campuses. In an era of retrenchment in higher education generally, large allocations for desegregation are increasingly unlikely. The development of missions and facilities at black colleges comparable to white institutions would require disproportionate allocations of funds for that purpose, and no state has proposed upgrading a black college to the level of "flagship institution" (Haynes 1980). Instead, most recent state appropriation figures show the increases for black colleges in formerly segregated states are falling behind increases for white institutions and for the statewide average as a whole (NASULGC 1980).

Commitment is the third major unknown quantity affecting overall desegregation goals. Of historic concern is the degree to which federal agencies have ignored black colleges as recipients of funding (Institute for Services to Education 1978; Southern Education Foundation 1972). This problem has been of particular concern to the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, which has lobbied for increased support for research and development projects at historically black colleges. Some progress has been made at the federal level. In 1977, the Food and Agriculture Act required that black land-grant colleges be included in the mainstream of state experiment station and cooperative extension work. If land-grant functions are removed from black colleges to eliminate unnecessary duplication, the intent of this act may be reformed (Haynes 1980).

The Carter administration proved generally supportive of black college concerns with a memorandum in 1979 (Middleton, Jan. 22, 1979) and an Executive Order in 1980 (E.O. 12232) to foster increased federal funding. Under the Executive Order, executive agencies are to set goals to increase the participation of black colleges and universities in federal programs, eliminate unintended and procedural barriers, and designate liaison officers to work with the secretary of education in implementing the order. The timing of the order, at the end of Carter's term, and the failure to place implementation efforts in the Office of Management and Budget closer to funding decisions are seen as limitations on the order's effectiveness. Analysis of the impact of administration support shows only small gains (Middleton, April 14, 1980, p. 11; U.S. Office of Education 1980). The Reagan administration has pledged support for black colleges, but across-the-board cuts in higher education may undermine recent progress.

Unresolved issues continue to hamper efforts to increase minority access to higher education. One of the most fundamental is the extent to

which cultural diversity is recognized as a positive factor in the educational experience of all students. Federal government policies have not been consistent. The central legal thrust of desegregation in public higher education has been the elimination of racial identifiability in formerly segregated white and black state colleges and universities. States must commit themselves to enhancing historically black institutions, but as yet no standard of white enrollment has been set to determine when a black college is "desegregated." The proceedings on Black College Day, September 29, 1980, demonstrated the extent to which black educators and students continue to perceive desegregation as a threat (Paul 1980b). In fall 1980, faculty, students, and alumni of Cheyney State College, the nation's oldest historically black college, filed suit to compel Pennsylvania and the U.S. Department of Education to develop and implement a statewide desegregation plan in accordance with OCR's Revised Criteria (U.S. Office for Civil Rights 1978). Plaintiffs sought a commitment by the state to remedy past inequities that have made Cheyney unequal in facilities and academic programs to other state colleges ("Cheyney Faculty" 1980; Randolph 1980; Paul 1980a).

On the other hand, the federal government has encouraged bilingual education to foster the cultural expression and educational opportunities of Hispanic students and the establishment of community colleges to serve native Americans. The Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (P.L. 94-482) and the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 (P.L. 95-471) specifically provide for community colleges responsive to the particular educational needs of native Americans. In the context of desegregation, however, this principle does not necessarily apply. The appointment of a white man to serve as president of Pembroke State College, founded for Indians in North Carolina, and the failure of the state to provide enhancement funds were challenged by Indians who sought to preserve the school's cultural heritage (Middleton, Aug. 6, 1979).

Summary and Conclusions

The concept of access has broadened and deepened as educators and policy makers have experienced the complexities involved in increasing the participation of minorities at all levels of higher education. To the long-standing concerns of black Americans have been added the problems of other ethnic and minority groups, particularly Hispanics, but also native Americans and women. To the original concentration on admission to higher education have been added the questions of secondary school preparation, college retention, and placement in graduate or professional schools.

The measure of success in achieving greater minority participation in higher education has become increasingly detailed as the concept has become increasingly multi-faceted. Gross enrollment statistics are no longer a sufficient indicator of access trends. Breakdowns by time period, type of institution, and field of study reveal areas of stagnation and decline. Figures for the past decade and a half demonstrate both large numerical gains and proportional gains for blacks and for Hispanics in particular. The movement for greater black enrollment started earlier and has slowed somewhat, and Hispanic enrollment started later, from a smaller numerical base, and has continued notable proportional advances.

The danger of competition is inherent in expanding the groups and issues included within the concept of access. This concern is reflected in the extent to which intended reform measures miss their mark: the declining participation of minority students in federal assistance programs and the declining proportion of Title III funds channeled to minority institutions are two noteworthy examples of this. In order to minimize the adverse effects of ethnic or minority rivalry, it is necessary to differentiate areas of shared concerns and problems unique to particular minority groups and to distinguish between measures of general value to increasing minority participation and measures of specific value to the needs of specific groups.

Areas of shared concern span the range of access issues. In particular, minority groups, especially blacks and Hispanics, suffer from inadequate secondary school preparation and counseling and from economic and psychometric barriers. They are disproportionately overrepresented in two-year institutions and underrepresented in four-year colleges and graduate and professional schools. They are more likely found enrolled part-time and in public institutions. Minority students from low socioeconomic levels are more likely to drop out before graduation. Although the patterns are somewhat different, black and Hispanic students are both underrepresented in scientific and technical fields and in courses that lead to the most remunerative positions. Because affirmative action programs for faculty hiring have failed to put large numbers of black and Hispanic faculty members on campus, minority students share problems of adjusting to unfamiliar and unsympathetic academic environments. Lastly, although the rates of short-run progress may vary, all minority groups are subject to the vagaries of political and economic change.

Problems of particular concern to individual minority groups spring from historical and cultural differences. The continued importance of tra-

ditionally black public and private colleges reflects their long history of service training educationally and economically disadvantaged black students. The expansion of opportunities for black students at traditionally white colleges has not, until recently, threatened minority enrollment at black colleges. The overconcentration of black students in education and liberal arts courses also is a legacy of historically limited occupational choices for educated blacks. At the undergraduate level these patterns are changing, with more students enrolled in business and technical courses. Comparable changes have not yet reached the graduate level.

The particular concerns of Hispanic students are of more recent origin. The Hispanic community, which is now growing rapidly, lacks the institutional presence in higher education that black colleges provide to the black community. Also, Hispanic students face a language barrier that is not shared with black students, although it is an issue for the growing numbers of refugees from Southeast Asia.

Measures of general applicability to increasing minority participation must be identified by educators and policy makers. Among those considered here are:

- Better definitions of educational opportunity, encompassing the range of access issues.
- More precise and accurate measures of minority enrollment to pinpoint more quickly areas of underrepresentation and stagnation.
- More specific articulation of institutional role and mission in terms of program offerings, target student groups, and geographical areas of service.
- Development of alternative admissions criteria that consider the strengths brought to higher education by minority students.
- Inclusion of retention efforts in the mainstream of academic functions with secure status and funding.

Measures of particular applicability to specific minority group concern must reflect a sensitivity to an institution's own makeup and institutional role. Such measures necessarily presuppose an internal system of data gathering to indicate trends in enrollment and to provide early warning of retention problems. Additional steps include:

- Recruitment of faculty and professional staff trained in teaching or counseling poorly prepared students and sensitive to diverse minority group needs.
- Development of campus services responsive to the linguistic and cultural traditions of minority students.

In their efforts to upgrade academic standards, traditionally black institutions must exercise caution in using standardized test scores lest they screen out the very students they were founded to serve. Similarly, two-year colleges must recognize their primary responsibility to full-time

students and work with upper-level institutions to facilitate the transfer of students who wish to continue. In both cases, planning, with particular concern for minority enrollment, is essential.

In either case, it is crucial that educators and policy makers try to gauge in advance the impact of appropriations on minority student enrollment and minority institutional development. If minorities are the intended beneficiary of a policy change or an increased appropriation, experience indicates that the measure be drawn as specifically as possible. The unanticipated consequences of the *Adams* suit, which threatened black colleges and the educational opportunities they represented, the unexpected flow of Title III funds to two-year colleges rather than to black colleges, the reduced participation of minority students in legal and medical education, all suggest that measures to increase minority access must be specific, well defined, and unremitting in order to ensure change and measure its impact.

Bibliography

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education abstracts and indexes the current literature on higher education for the National Institute of Education's monthly bibliographic journal *Resources in Education*. Many of these publications are available through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Publications cited in this bibliography that are available from EDRS include the ordering number and price at the end of the citation. To order a publication, write to EDRS, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. When ordering, please specify the document number. Documents are available as noted in microfiche (MF) and paper copy (PC).

Abramowitz, Elizabeth, ed. *Proceedings from the National Invitational Conference on Racial & Ethnic Data*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, 1976.

Advisory Council on Developing Institutions. *Strengthening Developing Institutions; Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Annual Report, March 1977*. Washington, D.C.: 1977. ED 146 833. MF-$1.06; PC-$8.70.

———. *Strengthening Developing Institutions; Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, Annual Report, March 1978*. Washington, D.C.: 1978. ED 167 044. MF-$1.06; PC-$6.70.

ACE-AALS Committee on Bakke. *The Bakke Decision: Implications for Higher Education Admissions*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, Association of American Law Schools, 1978. ED 158 681. MF-$1.06; PC-Not available from EDRS.

Arciniega, Tomas A. "Planning and Organizational Reform Issues Affecting Hispanics in Higher Education." Paper presented at the National Conference on the Education of Hispanics, Alexandria, VA. August 20-23, 1978. ED 178 262. MF-$1.06; PC-$5.05.

Astin, Alexander W. *The Myth of Equal Access in Public Higher Education*. Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1975.

Bailey, Robert L., and Hafner, Anne L. *Minority Admissions*. Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath, 1978.

Berrian, Albert H. "Persistence of Dual Systems of Higher Education [in North Carolina]." Typescript. July 1980, 5pp.

Beyond Desegregation: Urgent Issues in the Education of Minorities. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978.

Blackwell, James E. *Access of Black Students to Graduate and Professional Schools*. Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1975. ED 119 555. MF-$1.06; PC-$8.70.

Blake, Elias, Jr. Deposition of Elias Blake, Jr., November 9, 1971, *Adams* v. *Richardson*, Civil Action No. 3095-70.

———. "Public Policy and the Higher Education of Black Americans." In U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on the Judiciary. Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. *Civil Rights:* A Staff Report of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, 94th Congress, 2d session. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976. pp. 191-202.

Blake, Elias, Jr.; Lambert, Linda Jackson; and Martin, Joseph L., *Degrees Granted and Enrollment Trends in Historically Black Colleges: An Eight-Year Study*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, 1974. ED 096 879. MF-$1.06; PC-$6.70.

Bok, Derek C. "An Open Letter on Issues of Race at Howard" [Excerpt] *Washington Post*, March 5, 1981, p. A18.

Brazziel, William, and Brazziel, Marian. *Recent College and University Enrollment Patterns of Black Students in States Affected by Adams-Califano Litigation*. Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1980. ED 021 124. MF-$1.06; PC-$8.70.

Brown, Charles I., and Speller, Benjamin F., Jr. *Desegregation and the White Presence on the Black Campus: A Bibliography for Researchers.* Durham, N.C.: Institute on Desegregation, North Carolina Central University, 1980.

Brown, Peter. "U.S. Weighs Easing of State University Anti-Bias Deadlines." *Washington Post,* March 5, 1981, p. A12.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. *From Isolation to Mainstream: Problems of the Colleges Founded for Negroes.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. *Making Affirmative Action Work in Higher Education: An Analysis of Institutional and Federal Policies with Recommendations: A Report.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

———. *The Relevance of Race in Admissions.* Berkeley: 1977a. ED 151 465. MF-$1.06; PC-$3.40.

———. *Selective Admissions in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977b.

———. *Next Steps for the 1980's in Student Financial Aid: A Fourth Alternative.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Cheyney Faculty Ad Hoc Committee on Desegregation. "Save Cheyney—Why Legal Action?" *Fact Sheet* I (Sept. 1980).

"College Board Cuts SAT's in New York, Citing State's New Law on Testing." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 15, 1979, p. 2.

Commission on Higher Educational Opportunity in the South. *The Negro and Higher Education in the South.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1967. ED 017 047. MF-$1.06; PC-$6.70.

Committee on Institutional Cooperation Panel on Research and Development of Instructional Resources. *Development and Experiment in College Teaching.* Report No. 15. (Spring 1980).

Conrad, Clifton and Cosand, Joseph. *The Implications of Federal Education Policy* AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 1, Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1976. ED 124 066. MF-$1.06; PC-$6.70.

Cooke, Janet. "Gearing Up for Tests: D.C. Students Must Take College Prep Exam." *Washington Post,* October 2, 1980, p. DC-1.

Coughlin, Ellen K. "Minority Enrollment Rose 23.2 Pct. in Two Years." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* March 20, 1978, p. 21.

Crossland, Fred E. *Minority Access to College: A Ford Foundation Report.* New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Doermann, Humphrey. *Toward Equal Access.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978. ED 159 995. MF-$1.06; PC not available EDRS.

Egerton, John. *State Universities and Black Americans: An Inquiry into Desegregation and Equity for Negroes in 100 Public Universities.* Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1969. ED 028 744. MF-$1.06; PC-$8.70.

———. Black Public Colleges: Integration and Disintegration. Nashville: Race Relations Information Center, 1971. ED 052 268. MF-$1.06; PC-$5.05.

———. "Adams v. Richardson: Can Separate Be Equal?" *Change* 6 (December/January 1974): 29-36.

"80 Census Shows Sharp Rise in Blacks, Hispanics in U.S." *Washington Post,* February 24, 1981, p. A3.

Fact-File, "Race, Ethnicity, and Sex of Recipients of Bachelor's Degrees from Public Colleges." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 19, 1980, p. 8.

———. "A Profile of 1978-79 Ph.D.'s." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* December 8, 1980. p. 4.

———. "Correction." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 12, 1981, p. 22

———. "Undergraduate Enrollment, by Race, in U.S. Colleges and Universities." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 2, 1981, p. 6.

———. "Freshman Characteristics and Attitudes." *Chronicle of Higher Education.* February 9, 1981, pp. 7-8.

"Fall Enrollment Up 5.1 Pct., Sample Indicates." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* November 3, 1980, p. 10.

Fields, Cheryl M. and Jacobson, Robert L. "Nader Accuses ETS of 'Fraud.' Plans Drive for Testing Reform." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 21, 1980, pp. 5-6.

Fincher, Cameron. *A Study of Title III Impact on Historically Black Institutions.* Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1980. ED 190 712. MF-$1.06; PC-$6.70.

Fleming, Virginia, ed. *Financial Barriers to Equal Access in Higher Education.* Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1975. ED 124 020. MF-$1.06; PC-$8.70.

Freeman, Richard B. *Black Elite: The New Market for Highly Educated Black Americans.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

"The Future of the Black Colleges." *Daedalus* 100 (Summer 1971) pp. 539-899.

Godard, James M., ed. *Black and White Campuses in Urban Areas: Merger in Joint Planning?* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1980.

Goodrich, Andrew. "Developing a Data-Driven Retention Model for Improving Minority Student Persistence in Predominantly White and Historically Black Colleges." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, Boston, April 7-11, 1980. ED 186 525. MF-$1.06; PC-Not available from EDRS.

Gross, Theodore L. *Academic Turmoil: The Reality and Promise of Open Education.* Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1980.

Haynes, Leonard L., III, comp. *A Critical Examination of the Adams Case: A Source Book.* Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, 1978.

———. "Desegregation Planning Under the Adams Mandate." *AAHE Bulletin* 32 (May 1980): 13-15.

"Historically Black Colleges and Universities." E.O. 12232, August 8, 1980; 45 Fed. Reg. 53437-53438 (1980).

Hook, Janet. "Senate Panel Eyes Changes in Developing-College Aid." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* March 3, 1980, p. 14.

———. "Plan to Change Developing-College Aid Draws Fire." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* July 21, 1980, p. 15.

———. "Experts Question the Effects of New Law on Distribution of Aid to Needy Students." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* November 10, 1980, p. 7.

———. "Carter's Student-Loan Reform Program May Be Echoed by New Administration." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 26, 1981, p. 7.

———. "Processing for Pell Grants to Begin as Congress, Education Dept. Reach Compromise." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* April 6, 1981, p. 1.

———. "House Unit Recommends $700 Million More for Student Aid Than White House Budgeted." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* April 21, 1981, p. 17.

In Brief. "Black Percentage Unchanged in U.S. Medical Schools." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 19, 1980a, p. 2.

———. "More Women, Fewer Blacks Enrolled in Law Schools." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 19, 1980b, p. 2.

———. "Record Enrollment Reported in Medical Schools." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* November 17, 1980, p. 2.

Institute for Services to Education. *Federal Support of Black Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: Management Information Services, 1978.

———. "Dean Charges Qualified Blacks Rejected at Chapel Hill." *The Adams Report: A Desegregation Update,* (October 1978), p. 3.

———. "Education Department, Adams Plaintiffs Sign Consent Order." *The Adams Report: A Desegregation Update* 4 (Winter 1981), pp. 5-6.

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. *Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in U.S. Higher Education: An Assessment.* Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1976.

———. *Equal Educational Opportunity: More Promise Than Progress.* Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1978.

———. *Equal Educational Opportunity: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education, 1975-1977.* Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1980.

Ivey, Saundra. "Early Enrollment is Down 32 pct. at Tennessee State." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* September 4, 1979.

———. "The Nashville Merger." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 4, 1980, pp. 3-5.

Jacobson, Robert L. "Notes on . . . Law Schools" *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 17, 1981, p. 2.

———. "New Ruling on Race in Admissions Draws on 'Bakke' Decision" *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 23, 1981, p. 4.

Jencks, Christopher. *Who Gets Ahead? The Determinants of Economic Success in America.* New York: Basic Books, 1979.

Jones, Faustine Childress. *The Changing Mood in America: Eroding Commitment?* Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1977.

Jones, Larry G. *Black Students Enrolled in White Colleges and Universities: Their Attitudes and Perceptions.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1979.

Jones, Philip, ed. *Historical Perspectives on the Development of Equal Opportunity in Higher Education.* Iowa City. ACT Publications, 1978. ED 157 427. MF-$1.06; PC-$5.05.

LeMelle, T., and LeMelle, W. *The Black College: A Strategy for Relevancy.* New York: Praeger, 1969.

Leslie, Larry L. *Higher Education Opportunity: A Decade of Progress.* AAHE-ERIC/ Higher Education Research Report No. 3. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1977. ED 142 125. MF-$1.06; PC-$8.70.

Lloyd-Campbell, Crystal. *Adams v. Califano: A Case Study in the Politics of Regulation.* Washington, D.C.: Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education, 1979.

Lopez, Ronald W.; Madrid-Barela, Arturo; and Flores-Macias, Reynolds. *Chicanos in Higher Education: Status and Issues.* Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Center, University of California, 1976.

"LSAT to be Restructured." D.C. *Bar Report,* February/March 1981, p. 7.

McGrath, Earl J. *The Predominantly Negro Colleges and Universities in Transition.* New York: Teachers College, 1965.

Magarrell, Jack. "Recession Forces Cuts in Spending at Many State Colleges." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* September 2, 1980, p. 3-4.

"Serious Financial Problems Facing States Portend a Lean Year for Public Campuses." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* February 17, 1981, p. 1.

Martinez-Perez, Luis A. "Hispanic Students in Higher Education." Paper presented at the National Conference on the Education of Hispanics, Alexandria, VA. August 20-23, 1978. ED 178 257. MF-$1.06; PC-$5.05.

Maryland State Board for Higher Education. *The Impact of Academic Program Offerings on the Desegregation Process of the Maryland Postsecondary Education Institutions.* Annapolis, Md., 1977. ED 158 688. MF-$1.19; PC-Not available from EDRS.

Middleton, Lorenzo. "Black Colleges Fear Loss of Aid." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 3, 1978, p. 2.
———. "Minorities' Share of College Enrollment, Only 8 pct. in 1977." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 16, 1978, p. 18.
———. "U.S. Stresses Commitment to Black Colleges." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 13, 1978, p. 12.
———. "Carter Orders Greater Effort to Help Black Colleges." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 22, 1979, p. 17.
———. "N.C. Indians Oppose Selection of a White to Head College Originally Built for Them." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 6, 1979, p. 1.
———. "Bakke Decision Doesn't Bar Expansion of Affirmative Action, HEW Concludes." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 15, 1979, p. 11.
———. "Government to Help Black Colleges that Help Themselves, Official Says." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 10, 1979, p. 9.
———. "Desegregation in 5 States Slowed by Decrease in Black Enrollment." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 21, 1980, p. 15.
———. "Carter's Efforts to Aid Black Colleges Get Mixed Results, U.S. Report Says." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 14, 1980, p. 11.
———. "Increase Role of Black Colleges in U.S. Programs, Carter Orders." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, August 25, 1980, p. 20.
———. "College Systems in 4 States Found to Have Racial Imbalances; More Rulings Expected." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 12, 1981a, pp. 15-16.
———. "New Outbreak of Cross-Burnings and Racial Slurs Worries Colleges." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 12, 1981b, p. 1.
———. "Texas Desegregation Plan Accepted; Deadlines Set for 4 States." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 26, 1981, p. 13.
Miller, LaMar P., ed. *The Testing of Black Students: A Symposium*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
Mingle, James R. *Black and Hispanic Enrollment in Higher Education, 1978: Trends in the Nation and the South*. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1980. ED 191 378. MF-$1.06; PC-$6.70.
Mohr, Paul, ed. *Equality of Opportunity in Higher Education: Myth or Reality?* Lincoln, Neb.: Chicago-Southern Network of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, 1976.
Moore, William, Jr. *Academic Remediation in Higher Education: Problems and Prospect*. Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1978.
Morgan, Dan. "Blacks Gaining in Writing Skill; U.S. Level Static." *Washington Post*, January 16, 1981, p. A18.
Morris, Lorenzo. *Elusive Equality: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979.
"NAACP Chief Hits Court's Bakke Rule." *Washington Post*, July 5, 1978, p. A24.
NAACP Special Contribution Fund. *NAACP Report on Minority Testing*. New York: 1976.
Nader, Ralph and Narin, Allen. *The Reign of ETS: The Corporation that Makes Up Minds*. Washington, D.C.: Learning Research Project, 1980.
National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities. *Access of Black Americans to Higher Education: How Open Is the Door?* Washington, D.C.: 1979a. ED 172 669. MF-$1.06; PC-$8.70.
———. *Black Colleges and Universities: An Essential Component of a Diverse System of Higher Education*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office., 1979b. ED 183 066. MF-$1.06; PC-$10.35.

———. *Still a Lifeline: The Status of Historically Black Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980a.

———. *Target Date, 2000 AD: Goals for Achieving Higher Education Equity for Black Americans,* Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980b.

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. *Enrollment at State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Fall, 1979.* Washington, D.C., 1980.

National Board on Graduate Education. *Minority Group Participation in Graduate Education.* Washington, D.C., 1976. ED 125 494. MF-$1.19; PC-Not available from EDRS.

National Center for Education Statistics. *National Longitudinal Study: Withdrawal from Institutions of Higher Education; An Appraisal with Longitudinal Data Involving Diverse Institutions.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977. ED 150 913. MF-$1.06; PC-$16.85.

———. *The Condition of Education, 1978.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978a. ED 155 811. MF-$1.06; PC-$26.26.

———. *Traditionally Black Institutions of Higher Education: Their Identification and Selected Characteristics.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978. ED 169 834. MF-$1.06; PC-$3.40.

———. *Education in the United States: Statistical Highlights Through 1977-78.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1979a.

———. *Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1978.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1979b. ED 191 420. MF-$1.06; PC-not available from EDRS.

———. *The Condition of Education, 1980.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980.

National Institute on Access to Higher Education for the Mexican American. *Chicanos in Higher Education.* Albuquerque, N.M.: University of New Mexico Press, 1976.

National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks. *National Policy Conference on Education for Blacks: Proceedings.* Washington, D.C.: Congressional Black Caucus, U.S. House of Representatives, March 29-April 1, 1972. ED 109 268. MF-$1.06; PC-$12.00.

National Urban League. *The State of Black America, 1980.* New York: 1980.

Office for Advancement of Public Negro Colleges. *A National Resource: Historically Black Public Colleges and Universities.* Washington, D.C.: 1980.

Olivas, Michael A. "Hispanics in Higher Education: Status and Legal Issues." Paper presented to the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, Bal Harbour, Fla. October 4, 1978. ED 165 933. MF-$1.06; PC-$5.05.

———. *The Dilemma of Access.* Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press, 1979.

O'Neil, Robert M. *Discriminating Against Discrimination: Preferential Admissions and the DeFunis Case.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975.

Paul, Angus H. "Cheyney Students, Teachers Sue U.S., Charge College is Being Dismantled." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 6, 1980a, p. 6.

———. "Students March to Draw Attention to Black Colleges' Plight." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 6, 1980b, p. 6.

Peterson, Marvin W., et al. *Black Students on White Campuses: The Impacts of Increased Enrollments,* Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1978.

Randolph, Deborah A. "Black College Sues U.S., Pennsylvania Over Desegregation." *Wall Street Journal,* September 26, 1980, p. 1.

Rich, Spencer. "HEW Programs Said Unaffected by Bakke Ruling." *Washington Post,* April 22, 1979, p. A10.

———. "White-Black Gap in Income Widens, New Study Finds." *Washington Post*, January 23, 1980, p. A1.

———. "U.S. Lawyers Seek Historic Agreement on Minority Hiring." *Washington Post*, December 6, 1980, p. A1.

———. "U.S. Accepts Agreement on Tests for Federal Jobs." *Washington Post*, February 25, 1981, p. A2.

Robbins, Webster. "The Educational Needs of Native American Indians." In Castaneda, Alfredo; James, Richard L.; and Robbins, Webster. *The Educational Needs of Minority Groups*. Lincoln, Neb.: Professional Educators Publications, 1974.

Scully, Malcolm G. "Writing Abilities of Students Said to Vary Little in Decade." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 19, 1981, p. 8.

Smith, Cynthia J., ed. *Advancing Equality of Opportunity: A Matter of Justice*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for the Study of Educational Policy, 1977.

Smith, Jeff E., ed. *The Impact of Desegregation on Higher Education*. Durham, N.C.: Institute on Desegregation, North Carolina Central University, 1981.

Southern Education Foundation. *Small Change: A Report on Federal Support for Black Colleges*. Atlanta, 1972. ED 069 821. MF-$1.06; PC-$8.60.

———. *Ending Discrimination in Higher Education: A Report from Ten States*. Atlanta. 1974. ED 100 238. MF-$1.06; PC-$5.05.

Southern Regional Education Board—Participants of the Conference on Alternative Admissions Criteria for Minority Students (November 1975). A Position Paper Submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Concerning the Improvement of Retention Opportunities for Minority Students on Majority Campuses, June 1976.

———. "Increasing Minority Representation in Science." *Regional Spotlight*, 13 (November 1980).

"Text of HEW's Interpretation of Bakke." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 15, 1979, pp. 11-12.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *School Enrollment—Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1977*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 333, February 1979.

———. *Major Field of Study of College Students: October 1978*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 351, May 1980.

———. *Educational Attainment in the United States: March 1979 and 1978*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980. Current Population Reports, Series P-20, No. 356, August 1980.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978a. ED 159 290. MF-$1.06; PC-$14.01.

———. *The State of Civil Rights: 1977*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978b. ED 152 919. MF-$1.06; PC-$5.05.

———. *Toward an Understanding of Bakke*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979. ED 172 697. MF-$1.06; PC-$15.66.

———. *The State of Civil Rights: 1979*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1980. ED 183 658. MF-$1.06; PC-$5.05.

U.S. Congressional Budget Office. *Inequalities in the Educational Experiences of Black and White Americans*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1977. ED 150 228. MF-$1.06; PC-$6.70.

U.S. Office for Civil Rights. "Revised Criteria Specifying the Ingredients of Acceptable Plans to Desegregate State Systems of Higher Education." 43 Fed. Reg.

6658, Washington, D.C., 1978.

———. "Policy Interpretation of Anti-discrimination Regulations Under Title VI, including Affirmative Action for Clarification in Light of Bakke." 44 Fed. Reg. 58509, Washington, D.C., 1979.

———. *Racial, Ethnic and Sex Enrollment Data from Institutions of Higher Education Fall 1978.* Washington, D.C., 1980.

U.S. Office of Education. "Report on the President's Black College Initiative for Fiscal Year 1979." Typescript, 1980.

U.S. President's Commission on Higher Education. *Higher Education for American Democracy.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947.

"Va. Public Colleges Fail to Meet Goals for Black Enrollment." *Washington Post,* December 19, 1980, p. B3.

Washington Notes. "Many Civil-Rights Gains Threatened, Commission Says." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* January 21, 1980, p. 16.

Watkins, Beverly T. "College Degrees, Family Backgrounds Found to Be Main Factors Affecting Income." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* September 10, 1979, pp. 1, 13.

Whitaker, Joseph D. "Carter Pledged to Strong Black Colleges." *Washington Post,* November 7, 1978, p. C2.

Wickenden, James W. "How the SAT's are Used—and Sometimes Abused." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* September 29, 1980, p. 56.

Willie, Charles V., and Edmonds, Ronald R., eds. *Black Colleges in America: Challenge, Development, Survival.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Winkler, Karen J. "Graduate Schools' Enrollment Up 1 Pct. Despite Drop in Applications." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* December 8, 1980, p. 4.

AAHE-ERIC Research Reports

Ten monographs in the AAHE-ERIC Research Report series are published each year, available individually or by subscription. Prices for single copies are listed below. Orders for 25 or more of a single title are eligible for a bulk discount. For orders under $15 add 15% postage/handling fee. All orders under $15 must be prepaid. Subscription to ten issues (beginning with date of subscription is $30 for members of AAHE, $45 for nonmembers, add $5 for subscriptions outside the U.S.

Order from Publications Department, American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 780, Washington, D.C. 20036; 202/293-6440. Write or phone for a complete list of Research Reports and other AAHE publications.

1981 Research Reports—*AAHE members, $4 each; nonmembers, $5.50 each*

1. Minority Access to Higher Education
   Jean L. Preer
2. Institutional Advancement Strategies in Hard Times
   Michael D. Richards and Gerald R. Sherratt
3. Functional Literacy in the College Setting
   Richard C. Richardson Jr., Kathryn J. Martens, and Elizabeth C. Fisk

Other titles in the 1981 series to be announced.

1980 Research Reports—*AAHE members, $3 each; nonmembers, $4 each*

1. Federal Influence on Higher Education Curricula
   William V. Mayville
2. Program Evaluation
   Charles E. Feasley
3. Liberal Education in Transition
   Clifton C. Conrad and Jean C. Wyer
4. Adult Development: Implications for Higher Education
   Rita Preszler Weathersby and Jill Mattuck Tarule
5. A Question of Quality: The Higher Education Ratings Game
   Judith K. Lawrence and Kenneth C. Green
6. Accreditation: History, Process, and Problems
   Fred F. Harcleroad
7. Politics of Higher Education
   Edward R. Hines and Leif S. Hartmark
8. Student Retention Strategies
   Oscar T. Lenning, Ken Sauer, and Philip E. Beal
9. The Financing of Public Higher Education: Low Tuition, Student Aid, and the Federal Government
   Jacob Stampen
10. University Reform: An International Review
    Philip G. Altbach

1979 Research Reports—*AAHE members, $3 each; nonmembers, $4 each*

1. Women in Academe: Steps to Greater Equality
   Judith Gappa and Barbara Uehling
2. Old Expectations, New Realities: The Academic Profession Revisited
   Carol Herrnstadt Shulman
3. Budgeting in Higher Education
   J. Kent Caruthers and Melvin Orwig
4. The Three "R's" of the Eighties: Reducation, Retrenchment, and Reallocation
   Kenneth P. Mortimer and Michael L. Tierney
5. Occupational Programs in Four-Year Colleges: Trends and Issues
   Dale F. Campbell and Andrew F. Korim
6. Evaluation and Development of Administrators
   Robert C. Nordvall
7. Academic Advising: Getting Us Through the Eighties
   Thomas J. Grites
8. Professional Evaluation in the Eighties: Challenges and Response
   Glenn F. Nyre and Kathryn C. Reilly
9. Adult Baccalaureate Programs
   Marilou Denbo Eldred and Catherine Marienau
10. Survival Through Interdependence: Assessing the Costs and Benefits of Interinstitutional Cooperation
    Lewis D. Patterson